

The Stances of Provincial Ministries of Education towards Values/Moral Education in Public Schools

Don Cochrane
simon fraser university

David Williams
university of british columbia

Cette recherche a eu pour but de découvrir dans quelle mesure il existe une politique officielle relative à l'éducation morale et des valeurs dans l'organisation du système scolaire canadien, d'évaluer la mesure dans laquelle une telle politique se reflète dans la pratique, enfin d'examiner les problèmes de mise en oeuvre.

Cette étude révèle une image généralement décevante des politiques et des mises en pratique. L'examen des programmes-cadres, des matériaux de ressource à l'usage des élèves, des critères de sélection des manuels, du soutien des projets-pilotes, de l'avancement pédagogique dans ce domaine et de la tentative de mesurer la mise en oeuvre de ces politiques, tout conduit à prouver qu'on s'engage peu ou pas à traduire en pratique ces "politiques sur papier". On considère plusieurs raisons possibles pour expliquer cet échec: notions confuses de la matière concernée, ignorance des théories et parutions récentes, crainte des controverses religieuses et politiques et apathie ou désaccord du public quant au rôle des écoles dans l'éducation morale et des valeurs.

The burgeoning literature on values/moral education in Canada (1) is replete with conceptual and empirical studies, as well as instructional guides and materials. Thus far, however, there has not been an analysis in this field comparable to the Werner, Connors, Aoki, and Dahlie (2) monograph on ethnicity in Canadian social studies curricula. This report is a step towards such a comprehensive study in values/moral education.

The aims of this research have been:

1. to discover the extent to which there *is* official, public policy concerning values/moral education in Canadian school systems,
2. to appraise the extent to which such policies are reflected in practice,
3. to examine problems of sharpening, justifying, and implementing values/moral education policies in Canada.

Policy is used here to apply to any statement or directive intended to provide on-going sanction, either positive or negative, for institutional practice. Such statements as curriculum guidelines and textbook selection criteria are not always acknowledged as policy by institutional authorities

proclaiming them. Nevertheless, to the extent that statements, directives, guidelines, or regulations legitimize institutional action or inaction, the term “policy” will be applied to them in this paper.

We are very aware that the relationship between curriculum policy statements and school practice is often tenuous. Still the relevant curricular and administrative literature provides evidence at least of what is permitted, encouraged, prescribed, or prohibited. From this we reflect upon the climate of official opinion concerning values instruction and the level of awareness of literature and resources in moral education possessed by our provincial ministries.

The primary sources of information for this study were curriculum directors of provincial ministries of education and the documents produced by such ministries. A survey questionnaire requesting information and documentation was sent initially to each ministry. This information was supplemented by provincial curriculum documents, research reports, journal articles, and evidence from non-ministry contacts.

Problems in appraising replies to our questionnaire arose quickly. First, it was difficult to assess the degree to which responses were complete. Second, in some cases provincial curriculum directors (or those who were designated to reply on their behalf) seemed unaware of what documents were available and relevant to the questions posed. The present lack of a comprehensive moral education bibliography makes it difficult to check the completeness of ministry responses and documentation.

Third, we encountered the problem of accommodating replies from provinces where authority is decentralized in the area of values curriculum (e.g. in Newfoundland to its denominational education committees and in Alberta to local school boards at least with respect to “controversial issues”).

Finally, we encountered problems of communication arising from different meanings that can be ascribed to “values/moral education.” We cast our definitional net wide; in the questionnaire, we stipulated that we were interested in “the teaching of values, the examination and clarification of values, moral judgment and action, *and* the study of value-laden social issues.” The nature of the responses suggested that some respondents interpreted this very narrowly, thereby failing to include relevant documents and responses, or excessively broadly, thereby, for example, sending *any* document having to do with the social studies curriculum area.

THE EXTENT OF OFFICIAL PUBLIC POLICY

What we were prepared to accept as evidence came from many sources. Statements from provincial Public School Acts, departmental policy guidelines, official curriculum guides, statements by high officials of ministries of education, and ministry dicta or criteria for textbook selection were taken as evidence of official public policy — official and public in the

sense that the documents are published under the ministry of education imprint. The reports of government-appointed commissions in and of themselves were not regarded as policy. Likewise, the formation and pronouncements of teacher and lay associations designed to influence policy, while interesting developments which bear careful watching, do not constitute official, public policy.

In simple quantitative terms (see table 1) it appears that all provinces but one (Prince Edward Island) have some published policy or statement concerning part or all of the area surveyed in this study.

In the case of eight provinces (Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Alberta, Manitoba, British Columbia, and Newfoundland), the policies are contained in documents applying broadly to the total school system or to a particular level of schooling, such as elementary or junior secondary. However, a sharp distinction must be drawn between the explicit policy statements of Ontario and Nova Scotia, which deal exclusively with values and moral education, and those of other provinces, which only make brief reference to values or moral education in the context of general curriculum statements or guidelines.

In an explicit policy statement entitled "Values in Education in Nova Scotia" (6) the ministry of education of that province declares in effect that schools should encourage respect for moral principles, but instead of developing a positive policy, the ministry confounds the entire matter by focussing upon the relatively superficial question of whether or not morality should be taught as a separate subject for credit.

The 1974 statement by Ontario's Minister of Education, Thomas L. Wells, is the most unequivocal recent policy statement among those examined by us (4). In this unique document (at least in the Canadian context) and the subsequent *The Formative Years* (7), Ontario declares that moral reasoning and development are to be important goals of public education. Wells's paper goes so far as to suggest specific value questions for pupils at different age levels and specific guidelines for implementation. Such an approach is a refreshing contrast to the often cautious, contradictory, or non-existent policy in other Canadian jurisdictions.

The policy statements of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, and Newfoundland range from prescriptive to enabling, but have in common that they are not exclusively concerned with values and moral education. A rigorous definition¹ would limit the provinces showing a strong commitment to *moral* education to Ontario and Quebec. Alberta, Manitoba, and New Brunswick place emphasis on the clarification of personal and social values. The "Aims of Public Education in Newfoundland and Labrador" (5) sanction moral and religious training by precept and example, but the decentralized structure of Newfoundland schools devolves specific policy and controls to denominational education committees. In British Columbia the references to values clarification (8)

Table 1 / Provincial Policy and Guidelines in Values and Moral Education

	General Guidelines	Guidelines in Specific Subject Curricula	Comments
British Columbia	Yes	Yes	B.C. Public Schools Act states without elaboration, "The highest morality shall be inculcated." Values clarification listed, but not encouraged in elementary social studies guide; secondary social studies lists normative discourse as one class (content unspecified) of objectives.
Alberta	Yes	Yes	Not prescriptive and allows for local variation. Social studies guides advocate Values Clarification. Some references in language arts and science guides.
Saskatchewan	No	Yes	Elective in Christian Ethics. Social studies guides sanction valuing "skills" and study of values as cultural phenomena. No explicit mandate for elementary grades.
Manitoba	Yes	Yes	Interim position papers for middle grades and social studies recommend values clarification and "moral development." Handbook for Values Clarification in group counselling provided.
Ontario	Yes	Yes	Intermediate Division history and geography guides recommend "awareness of values and value alternatives" (3). No evidence of Wells's (4) explicit emphasis on moral development in Ontario Social Studies guides.
Quebec	Yes	Yes	Roman Catholic schools prescribe religious instruction for students and "personality development and moral instruction" for those exempted from religious instruction. It is not clear whether the Protestant school guides for the same curricular areas are prescriptive or elective.
New Brunswick	Yes	Yes	Both French and English documents emphasize clarification of personal and social values. French-language studies guides list very specific values to be developed.
Prince Edward Island	No	No	Pilot project in two high schools — documents not yet available.
Nova Scotia	Yes	No	Separate course in values/moral education "not necessary" though not forbidden either. Promotion of "respect for ethical and moral principles" encouraged in Nova Scotia Education Act.
Newfoundland	Yes	No	Little centralized direction. Moral/religious training by precept and example sanctioned by "Aims of Public Education in Newfoundland and Labrador" (5). Implementation controlled by denominational education committees.

and analysis of value questions in social studies curriculum guides (9) are so scanty as to leave in doubt whether or not the Public Schools Act in conjunction to “inculcate” the highest morality is known to curriculum developers.

Alberta policy statements, such as “Policy Statement re Controversial Issues” (10), *Experiences in Decision-Making* (11), and *Responding to Change* (12), advocate that among its aims “social studies . . . should promote free choice of values to live by.” Among the values mentioned in *Experiences in Decision-Making* (11) are the dignity of man, freedom, equality, justice, empathy, and loyalty. However, such values are not to be taught prescriptively; rather, students must have freedom to accept or reject them. The policy statement regarding “controversial issues” (10) grants to local school trustees autonomy to determine what issues are too controversial to be examined in district schools, and how controversial issues when permitted are to be treated. One wonders what effect this policy has on “free choice of values to live by” and on the utilization of the values clarification methodology advocated in provincial guides.²

In Saskatchewan there appears to be no *general* policy or guidelines for values/moral education, although specific course outlines contain “objectives dealing with values.” For example, the Saskatchewan ministry publishes senior secondary school curriculum guides for a three-year program in Christian Ethics (14) aimed at the “Christian actualization” of students. Various social studies guides make brief reference to values as cultural phenomena to be studied from a social science point of view.

The current score, then, on the existence of official public policy stands as follows:³

- Both general and specific policy: six provinces (Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, Manitoba, Quebec, New Brunswick)
- General policy only: two provinces (Newfoundland, Nova Scotia)
- Specific subject policy only: one province (Saskatchewan)
- No policy: one province (Prince Edward Island)

IMPLEMENTATION OF STATED AIMS OF VALUES/MORAL EDUCATION

Evidence of intent to implement policies (where and if they exist) can take many forms. To date, we have asked the following questions of the officials surveyed and documents collected:

1. What teacher guides or student materials have ministries provided? To what extent do such materials reflect official policy?
2. What experimental or on-going projects or programs in values/moral education are ministries supporting?
3. What pre-service and in-service teacher preparation programs or services in values/moral education do ministries require, present, or at least make available?

4. What efforts, if any, have ministries made to determine whether or not their policy is being implemented?

It was beyond the scope of this paper to try to determine the extent to which official policy was reflected in actual classroom practice.

Curriculum Guides

We received from ministries of education numerous curriculum guides for specific courses or areas of the school curriculum that bore little or no relationship to official values/moral education policy in those jurisdictions. In fact, they contained no specific references to values to be taught, or moral development and evaluative reasoning objectives or activities, or even controversial issues. As table 1 indicates, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland provide no specific-subject teacher guides to help teachers apply general provincial policy in values/moral education.

A number of provinces do publish social studies, language arts, or counselling curriculum guides that make reference to clarifying personal and social values (i.e. Alberta, New Brunswick, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan), providing a forum for the discussion of value questions (British Columbia), and promoting evaluative reasoning (Saskatchewan and New Brunswick). However, such references are by and large superficial and devoid of content and examples.

Only three provinces (Ontario, Quebec, and Saskatchewan) provide teacher guides for curricula of specifically moral/ethical character. In the Quebec Protestant School guides (15), as well as the Saskatchewan guides to Christian Ethics, moral education is not clearly differentiated from religious instruction. Although we did not receive copies of guides for the traditional religious/values instruction in the Roman Catholic schools of Quebec, we are informed (16) that recent research in the field of moral education had had little or no impact on these curriculum documents. It is worth noting, however, that in the course designed for students exempted from religious instruction in the Roman Catholic system, moral education has been weaned from its religious framework (17). Beck's *Moral Education in the School* (18) and *The Reflective Approach in Values Education* (19) are provided by the Ontario Ministry of Education as teachers' discussion guides.

Student Resource Materials

Ontario, Saskatchewan, Quebec, Alberta, Manitoba, and New Brunswick provide, or at least list, student resource materials for some form of values/moral education. British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia either provide no such materials or provide materials which do not reflect a coherent values/moral education approach.

There is a general problem with which we do not deal, although we are

aware of its importance. The fact that provinces such as Alberta, Manitoba, and Ontario list student materials embodying approaches to values/moral education does not guarantee they will actually be available in schools. Such materials are purchased by school boards and may or may not be ordered by schools from among the many titles listed in provincial resource manuals.

The materials contained in the Alberta list, *Resource Materials for Elementary Social Studies* (20), include the DUSO (Developing Understanding Self and Others) kits and Guidance Associates' *First Things: Values*. Such materials embody markedly different conceptions of values/moral education, some of which may not even be consistent with official policy.

In fact, with the exception of New Brunswick, it does not appear that any provincial ministry or school authority in Canada makes a point of providing on a general basis pupil resource materials specifically designed for or adapted to the values/moral education approach advocated in that jurisdiction. New Brunswick policy advocates clarification of personal and social values as a major objective of social studies education. A textbook called *Making Value Judgements* (21) is provided for students of junior high school social studies. This resource book, along with a matching teacher guide, embodies an application and elaboration of the Raths, Harmin, and Simon "values clarification" approach. In this one instance, we have some evidence of consistency between policy and implementation.

Textbook/Materials Selection Criteria

Ministry of education materials selection criteria might be assumed to implement or embody policy concerning values/moral education content or approaches. Nova Scotia and Manitoba have criteria to exclude sexist, ethnic, racial, and religious bias in school materials. British Columbia has anti-sexist-bias criteria. Although a few provinces have such resource material selection guidelines, by and large they lack criteria that either mandate or forbid consideration of sexist or racist issues from a moral viewpoint (or in any other normative way). No province appears to have criteria to *ensure* inclusion of moral consideration of controversial issues, although Manitoba (22) acknowledges "a public duty to inject into our educational system positive influences which will help create sensitivity to basic human rights and feelings."

It must be observed that the materials selection criteria that we examined fail to implement or promote existing ministry of education values/moral education policy.

Pilot Projects and Programs

We have also taken as evidence of a serious approach the support by

ministries of education for experimental or pilot projects. In Ontario the Ministry of Education sent a letter to all school boards requesting that each board establish a steering committee to investigate the desirability of implementing a moral development program in its school system. To support its broad initiative this province has actively encouraged regional centres of the Ministry of Education to co-ordinate and support these "pilot" programs. In this area Ontario is, in fact, the outstanding exception to the general pattern of apathy, lack of support, and caution on the part of ministries of education.

The Manitoba Department of Education gave financial support to the Winnipeg School Division Social Concerns Project (23), directed by Dr. Terry Morrison of the University of Manitoba. This project utilized a variety of approaches including some "Kohlbergian" moral reasoning procedures and assessment techniques. However, the Social Concerns Project was basically local and university initiated rather than Department initiated.

The Quebec ministry has issued "experimental editions" of course guides entitled *Moral and Religious Instruction* and *Personality Development and Moral Instruction*. These courses will be options to the more traditional classes in religious instruction. Because the program is so new, information concerning its nature and scope is scarce.

Prince Edward Island reports "pilot projects in two high schools," and Nova Scotia reports departmental "monitoring" of "local courses." However, no details of the nature, results, and monitoring procedures for these projects and courses are yet available. Other provinces (Newfoundland, British Columbia, Alberta, and New Brunswick) report no deliberate support for pilot projects in values/moral education.

Teacher Preparation

No province seems to require teachers to undertake pre-service courses or training in values/moral education. Newfoundland reports "optional" teacher training courses in religious education, and some universities offer teacher training courses in values/moral education (e.g. U.B.C., Manitoba, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Western Ontario, and the University of Calgary). However, these do not reflect ministry of education initiatives.

Nor do provincial education authorities appear to take teacher in-service in values/moral education any more seriously. British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island report that the ministry provides no in-service in values/moral education. New Brunswick reports that some in-service is provided "on request." Quebec provides in-service to teachers involved in field-testing of experimental programs in moral and religious instruction. Apparently, the province-wide program of in-service for Nova Scotia teachers of elementary school Health, Growth, and

Development includes some work in values/moral education. In its policy statement (24) the ministry claims that it would endorse increased pre- and in-service training if it could be shown that teachers are failing to clarify and re-emphasize the central place of values in the education of all students. Such a conditional stance is not a call to arms! Alberta and Ontario report in-service “available” through consultants in regional centres. In short, with the possible exception of Ontario none of the in-service reported appears to be particularly widespread or systematic in terms of values/moral education.

Efforts to Determine Whether or Not Policy Is Being Implemented

On the whole, ministries of education seem even less interested in evaluating the impact of values/moral education programs and policies on schools and students than they are in provincial assessment or monitoring in other curriculum areas. Five of the nine provinces (New Brunswick, Quebec, Newfoundland, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia) report no evidence concerning assessment of program effectiveness or of the extent of implementation in values/moral education. In the case of British Columbia, the 1976–77 provincial learning assessment in social studies should yield some relevant, if limited, evidence. *A Report of an Assessment* (25) found that in Alberta values instruction was a “pervasive orientation in fewer than 20%” of social studies classes. This appears to be the only province-wide assessment. The MacKay Report (26), on the basis of hearings held from 1966 to 1969, was critical of religious education practices in Ontario at that time. It recommended instead the comparative religion and moral development approaches which now constitute Ontario policy. However, except for reports of pilot projects sponsored by regional centres, Ontario has not recently undertaken a comprehensive assessment of programs in values/moral education.

Prince Edward Island and Quebec appear to have co-ordinators of “guidance and values instruction” and “programme de formation morale” respectively. Part of their responsibilities may be to monitor values/moral education activities on behalf of their ministries of education.

The limitations of all of these efforts should not be minimized. The Alberta and British Columbia social studies assessments focus upon a single subject area, where the values element is only one of many concerns. Commission studies, such as the MacKay Report (26) and Graham Report (27), where they have taken place at all, have been at irregular intervals. Ministry co-ordinators have many tasks in addition to monitoring or assessment. In any case, their monitoring and assessment activities have not yet yielded public documents or evidence. It is not surprising, therefore, that a reliable and comprehensive picture of values/moral development in even one province is not available.

PROBLEMS OF SHARPENING, JUSTIFYING, AND IMPLEMENTING POLICY IN VALUES/MORAL EDUCATION

This somewhat cursory review reveals, we believe, a generally disappointing picture of ministry of education policies and practices. Although no provinces explicitly forbid programs in values/moral education, many (e.g. British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and Nova Scotia) give little or no encouragement to them. Though there is positive policy in Alberta and New Brunswick, its emphasis is restricted primarily to values clarification approaches. We are promised more substantial and coherent values/moral education policy and curriculum guides from Alberta, but these have yet to appear. In Quebec, for the most part, and in Newfoundland, moral education is seen as a subset of religious education. The experimental project in Quebec is one bright spot on the map and will bear watching. Only in Ontario do we see a combination of conditions which make the widespread implementation of moral education a practical possibility.

We cannot resist the temptation to speculate on the reasons for official neglect or confusion in this area. Among the more obvious reasons for the dismal situation in Canada are confused notions of the field, ignorance of recent theory and literature, fear of controversy, including religious and denominational friction, and public apathy and disagreement about the role of schools in influencing student values, moral thought, and conduct,

Confused Notions of the Field

One overwhelming impression gained from official documents we examined is of confusion and inconsistency within and among Canadian educational jurisdictions concerning the nature of and so the justification of values/moral education.

In Quebec, Newfoundland, and Saskatchewan, moral education is a part of religious education, "Christian actualization," or induction into a particular religious culture or denomination. The explanation for such a state of affairs is to be found, we believe, more in the twists and turns of Canadian history than in any rational working out of the relationship and differences between moral and religious education.⁴

Alberta and New Brunswick documents fail to question the strong assumption of ethical relativism underlying the Raths, Harmin, and Simon approach to values clarification. Is it not an absurdity within a program such as that outlined in Alberta's *Experiences in Decision-Making* (11) that students are left free to accept or reject such values as the dignity of persons, freedom, equality, and justice? Such a predicament may only be the result of bad drafting, but it is there in print nonetheless.

Further, in documents from Alberta, New Brunswick, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan there is little awareness that moral questions may differ

insignificantly from prudential, aesthetic, or other value questions. That all of these might differ in important respects from preferences of personal taste is not tackled aggressively. In short, such documents appear to reflect or be consistent with an unquestioning acceptance of the naive and relativistic assumptions of the “values clarification” approach.

Ontario encourages a “Kohlbergian” approach, “to develop the moral sensitivity necessary for a complete and responsible life” (7). No other province focusses so explicitly on moral education. It must, however, be acknowledged that the range of approaches being adopted or piloted by the ministry’s regional centres in Ontario is quite diverse, though the annual reports from the centres and the writings of Beck et al. are insufficiently precise to provide a clear picture. This diversity is understandable given that Ontario’s policy does not mandate or even favor a particular approach.

Ignorance of Recent Theory and Literature

On the whole, ministries show little or no awareness of recent approaches to values/moral education. While “values clarification” is the best-known approach to *values* education, even Kohlberg’s moral development approach appears to be known in only two or three provinces. Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island show lack of awareness or interest in *any* particular approach. Despite the work of U.B.C.’s Association for Values Education and Research, the British Columbia ministry of education shows similar ignorance or lack of interest. The references in Saskatchewan social studies guides to the Coombs-Meux approach (31) to evaluative decision-making and in the Alberta documents to Fraenkel’s valuing strategies (32, pp. 228–277) are, though superficial, exceptions to the general absence of these approaches in provincial curriculum guides. The work of Wilson (33), Bull (34), and Phail (35) appears to be similarly ignored or unknown. Perhaps not surprisingly, in provinces such as Quebec, Saskatchewan, and Newfoundland, where religious and denominational education receives special attention, both the ministries and the denominational school authorities fail to incorporate any reference to the recent literature in moral development and ethics, or the possible autonomy of moral reasoning. Quebec’s experimental program provides a possible exception to this generalization. It appears to be informed by the widest grasp of the literature.

Fear of Political Controversy, Including the Anticipation of Religious and Denominational Friction

The contrasting roles of the ministries of education in Quebec and Newfoundland (relative to denominational religious education) are perhaps significant. The Quebec ministry is now taking an active role in developing, publishing, and piloting curriculum guides for denominational

religious instruction, and for those exempted from religious instruction it has produced *Personality Development and Moral Instruction* (17). In Newfoundland the ministry apparently defers completely to the denominational education committees. Although denominational and religious friction undoubtedly occurs in both jurisdictions, the stance of the Quebec ministry is considerably bolder than that of Newfoundland.

Through the "Policy Statement re Controversial Issues" (10) the Alberta ministry has apparently divested itself of considerable responsibility in favor of local community standards. Nova Scotia combines bold policy statements with avoidance of any specific guidelines or resources for implementation of policy. Fear of controversy may in part explain these situations in Alberta and Nova Scotia.

It is difficult to judge whether the lack of specific guidelines and resources in British Columbia and Prince Edward Island indicates fear of controversy, indifference, or satisfaction with the "hidden curriculum." The B.C. *Public Schools Act* (36, ch. 319, section 167) indicates that "The highest morality shall be inculcated, but no religious dogma or creed shall be taught." However, authors of provincial curriculum guides appear studiously to ignore this injunction.

At least on the basis of official documents, Ontario stands out as less fearful than other jurisdictions though not less beleaguered by political or religious controversy in the area of values and moral education.

Public Apathy and Disagreement

Public sentiment concerning the role of schools in values and moral education is strikingly confused and sometimes surprisingly apathetic. The "values school" advocates in British Columbia (37) and elsewhere argue for special schools to inculcate traditional virtues; Renaissance clubs in Manitoba and Ontario advocate avoidance of open-ended discussion of value issues in public school classrooms. A few outspoken critics of "permissive" public schools argue for both of these positions. "Morality" in school is at least a matter of serious concern to groups such as these. Yet many of the public are curiously silent or perhaps indifferent about what schools should do about values and morality. Perhaps they are satisfied with the "socialization towards conformity" which typifies so much of the process of Canadian schooling.

CONCLUSIONS

We suspect that success or failure in publicly supported school enterprises in values and moral education is related to the presence or absence of several factors: a clear conception of the endeavor; awareness of the relevant literature and theory; policy that legitimizes the activity; a strong, sympathetic minister or ministry of education; resources for teacher

training; and a secure link among university, field personnel, and ministry.⁵ Ontario is the only province that possesses all of these attributes to some degree at least. By contrast, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island appear to lack every single one.

NOTES

1. Moral education is strictly defined here as that part of education centrally concerned with initiating students into an objective mode of moral reasoning based upon such principles as concern for the rights and interests of others and for justice. This would exclude most versions of values clarification and many forms of religious education.
2. The Alberta Ministry of Education prepared a revised statement of educational goals and this was adopted by the legislature in the spring of 1978. In addition a revised social studies curriculum was to have been prepared explicitly emphasizing "moral reasoning (à la Kohlberg) and values analysis (à la Banks and Clegg) more than values clarification (à la Raths et al.)" (13).
3. This is simply a quantitative summary of the existence of values/moral education policy. No qualitative judgments are implied here. It is, for example, questionable whether or not the weak references to values clarification and questions in B.C. social studies guides should be regarded as policy.
4. For discussions of this issue see, for example, Hirst (28), C. H. Hamm (29), and A. J. Watt (30).
5. For an expanded discussion of these ideas see Cochrane and Williams (38).

REFERENCES

1. D. Cochrane. *Moral values education in Canada: A bibliography and directory 1970-77*. Toronto: Publication Division, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1978.
2. W. Werner; B. Connors; T. Aoki; & J. Dahlie. *Whose culture? Whose heritage? Ethnicity within Canadian social studies curricula*. Vancouver: College Printer, 1977.
3. *Intermediate division geography and Intermediate division history*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1977.
4. T. L. Wells. "Moral education — a view from the ministry." Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1974.
5. Aims of public education in Newfoundland and Labrador. *The School Board*. St. John's, Nfld. Denominational Education Committees, 1974.
6. Values education in Nova Scotia. *Journal of Education* (N.S.), 1975-76, 3(2), 24-27.
7. *The formative years*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1975.
8. *Elementary school curriculum guide: Social studies — 1974*. Victoria: British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1974.
9. *Secondary school curriculum guide: Social studies — 1968*. Victoria: British Columbia Ministry of Education, 1968.
10. *Policy statement re controversial issues*. Edmonton: Alberta Department of Education, n.d. (Mimeographed.)
11. *Experiences in decision making: Elementary social studies handbook*. Edmonton: Alberta Department of Education, January 1971.
12. *Responding to change: Secondary social studies handbook*. Edmonton: Alberta Department of Education, 1974.
13. C. D. Ledgerwood. Personal communication, June 13, 1977.
14. *Curriculum guide: Christian ethics and Teacher's guide: Christian ethics*. Regina: Saskatchewan Department of Education, January 1975.

15. *A teacher's guide and resource book for moral and religious instruction*. Quebec: Department of Education, September 1971. *Course outline for moral and religious instruction, draft revision*. Quebec: Ministry of Education, June 1974.
16. C. Lamond. Personal communication, February 8, 1977.
17. *Personality development and moral instruction*. Curriculum guide approved by Catholic Committee of the Superior Council of Education. Issued by the Quebec Ministry of Education, May 1969.
18. C. Beck. *Moral education in the schools*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1974.
19. C. Beck et al. *The reflective approach in values education: The Moral Education Project, year 3*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1976.
20. *Resource materials for elementary social studies*. An annotated list of titles for the basic program. Edmonton: Alberta Department of Education, 1975.
21. C. A. Elder. *Making value judgments*. Columbus, O.: Charles E. Merrill, 1972.
22. *Textbook evaluation*. Excerpts from the report of the Task Force on Textbook Evaluation. Winnipeg: Manitoba Department of Education, n.d.
23. T. R. Morrison. Social Concerns and Curriculum Development Project, interim report. Winnipeg School Division No. 1, February 1975.
24. Values in education in Nova Scotia. *Journal of Education (N.S.)*, 1975-76, 3(2), 24-27.
25. T. Aoki et al. *A report of an assessment: Social studies in Alberta* — 1975.
26. Committee on Religious Education in the Public Schools of the Province of Ontario. *Religious information and moral development*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1969.
27. *Report of Royal Commission on Education, Public Services and Provincial-Municipal Affairs*, Vol. 3, ch. 41. Province of Nova Scotia.
28. P. H. Hirst. *Moral education in a secular society*. London: University of London Press, 1974.
29. C. H. Hamm. Moral education without religion. *Teacher Education*, 1974, 7, 44-45.
30. A. J. Watt. *Rational moral education*. Parkville, Australia: Melbourne University Press, 1976.
31. J. Coombs & M. Meux. Teaching strategies for value analysis. In L. E. Metcalf (Ed.), *Values education: Rationale, strategies and procedures*. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971.
32. J. R. Fraenkel. *Helping students think and value*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
33. J. Wilson. *Practical methods in moral education*. London: Heinemann, 1972.
34. N. J. Bull. *Moral Education*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1969.
35. P. McPhail; J. R. Ungood-Thomas; & H. Chapman. *Moral education in the secondary school*. Schools Council Project in Moral Education. London: Longman, 1972.
36. *British Columbia Public Schools Act*. Victoria: Queen's Printer, 1975.
37. J. Kehoe & W. Bruneau. The values school movement in Surrey, British Columbia. *Moral Education Forum*, 1976, 1(4), 12-15.
38. D. Cochrane & D. Williams. Moral education in Canadian studies: A modest proposal. *History and Social Science Teacher*, 1977, 13(1), 1-7.

Don Cochrane, a visiting professor in the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University from 1976 to 1978, is an associate professor in social and philosophical foundations of education at California State University Northridge, Northridge, Calif. 91330, U.S.A.

David Williams is an associate professor of social studies in the Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., V6T 1W5