

Part III

Implications for public education: The spiritual and moral dimension to the school curriculum

The possibility of educating young people in meaning, identity and spirituality in government schools needs to be understood within a broader conceptualisation of the spiritual and moral dimension to the school curriculum. While spiritual and moral purposes for public education in Australia have become increasingly prominent, there remains a significant gap between theory and practice. This part of the book sets out to develop a conceptualisation that links school education and personal change in young people. Real progress in curriculum provisions for young people's spiritual and moral development depends on having a realistic account of the possibilities and limitations of schooling for catalysing personal change. Such a conceptualisation is needed to secure the professional support of teachers as regards their role in promoting young people's personal development. While Part III focuses on public education, the arguments have equal relevance to independent schools.

Complementing the material on curriculum theory, the last chapter in this part provides a practical example of an area of study to illustrate the sorts of issues that might be addressed in across-the-curriculum studies as well as in special subjects. It explores the shaping influence of film and television on young people's spiritual and moral development.

Chapter 11

The spiritual and moral dimension to the school curriculum: The evolution in personal development aims for Australian education

Perhaps the greatest wrong we have done to our children is not the fractured families or the scarcity of jobs, but the creation of a culture that gives them nothing beyond themselves to believe in. It is a culture whose main effects are to encourage demoralisation, cynicism, and self-centredness. It is imperative to create a culture (through parenting, education and the media) that gives people, especially the young, faith in themselves, hope for the future, and meaning and purpose to their lives.

W Campbell et al., 1992¹

Even where there were no official statements detailing the school's aim to promote the spiritual and moral development of young people, it is likely that this purpose would have been implied in the ways teachers looked after their pupils. They were

always concerned with the welfare of their pupils as persons, and not just with the development of literacy and numeracy. What was said in a recent national education statement in 2003 had long been the case in practice: ‘education is as much about building character as it is about equipping students with specific skills.’² The importance of this spiritual-moral aim has probably never been in question, but articulating what it implies for classroom practice has remained a perennial problem. Perennial, because the problem has been not so much in finding the right content and pedagogy, but in the very complexity of young people’s spiritual and moral development itself. The links between teaching and learning processes and personal change in pupils are naturally much more complex and tenuous than those with knowledge of mathematics or science.

This chapter is concerned with the public discourse about the spiritual and moral dimension to the school curriculum. Ongoing clarification of what this dimension entails is needed if there are to be both realistic purposes and effective implementation.

The first important distinction to be made is between the spiritual-moral influence of the school as a community (through its social and organisational structures) and the curriculum (what is planned and implemented in classroom practice). While not questioning the importance of the former, the discussion here will be concerned mainly with the latter.

11.1 Public discourse about the spiritual-moral dimension to education

The importance of promoting young people’s spiritual and moral development has long been evident in normative documents on the purposes of education for Australian schools. For example, in 1957 the NSW Wyndham Report named ‘spiritual values’ as one of the eight key aims for the education of the individual.³ Aims related to a spiritual-moral-values dimension have figured in Australian State education aims documents from that time, as well as in the national document *The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-first Century* (1999). But there have been difficulties in developing this sort of spiritual-moral languaging of educational aims, and even more difficulty in their implementation.

When the identity of government schools that were ‘free, compulsory and secular’ was being differentiated from religious schools, it was understandable that the religious terms used for describing personal development in the latter would not be appropriate in the former. It would take time for a suitable language to evolve within public education for talking about the spiritual and moral development of pupils. What gradually emerged in the curriculum documents of both state and Commonwealth education authorities was a raft of personal development terms that figured in the aims for schools: spiritual, moral and aesthetic development; character; self-esteem.⁴ Complementing the more traditional aims for knowledge and skills, they focused on promoting the growth and development of the whole person – the idea of a ‘holistic education’.⁵

The discussion of young people’s spiritual and moral development in normative curriculum documents, as well as in education theory generally, fell into four distinct but related areas:

- 11.1.1 Personal development terms used for articulating spiritual-moral purposes to education
- 11.1.2 Listing of core values for education (both the values underpinning education and the values it is hoped will be developed in pupils)
- 11.1.3 Particular teaching programs in values, and in subjects like Ethics, Personal Development, Religion and Philosophy
- 11.1.4 Across-the-curriculum strategies for promoting pupils' spiritual-moral development
- [not styled]

Problems appeared in the discourse because insufficient attention was given to the different (but related) requirements of each area. For example, talk about 'values education' was often diffuse and unfocused because it tried to address all four areas at once; the ensuing vagueness hampered both the conceptualisation of a values dimension to education and implementation in the classroom. More differentiation and precision are needed for the agendas in each of these four areas. Most of our attention in Part III will be given to the fourth area.

11.1.1 Personal development terms used for articulating spiritual-moral purposes to education

This section reports on the emergence of key personal development terms in a sample of three national education aims documents since 1989. It reflects what was happening generally in Australian educational discourse. The new personal development terms introduced by each document are listed in three columns, showing how the collection of terms was gradually extended.

Table 11.1 Emergence of personal development terms in national documents on the goals for Australian schools

Personal development terms used to articulate the goals of schools as introduced by each document:	The Hobart declaration on schooling: <i>Common and agreed national goals for schooling in Australia (1989)</i>	New elements added by <i>The Adelaide declaration on national goals for schools in the 21st century (1999)</i>	New elements added by the <i>National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools (2003)</i>
Personal characteristics	attitudes; values; self-confidence; optimism; high self-esteem; respect for others; personal excellence; judgment in morality, ethics, and social justice;	self-worth; social, moral, spiritual and aesthetic development; healthy lifestyle,	character; personal fulfilment; commitment; wellbeing; resilience (as an antidote to youth suicide and youth substance abuse); engagement; belonging; empowerment; participation; service; improved relationships;

Derived qualities	active and informed citizens; concern for balanced development and the global environment.	stewardship of the natural environment; respect for our cultural heritage.	holistic development. personal and social responsibilities; civic participation.
-------------------	--	--	--

Gradually, a comprehensive set of purposes emerged for public education that addressed spiritual and moral development. This in itself is a significant achievement, as is the listing of core values noted in section 11.1.2. However, persistent difficulties remain in areas 3 and 4 on implementation.

While the significance of personal aims for schooling is acknowledged, their ultimate impact depends on the school context, which may be affected more by other aims. Depending on where the relative emphasis is placed in practice, conflict in aims can occur, or the marginalisation of some purposes. For example, the fourth national goal for schooling in the Hobart Declaration (1989) signalled the growing importance that aims with economic, employment and productivity implications would have in the decades ahead:

Aim 4: To respond to the current and emerging economic and social needs of the nation, and to provide those skills which will allow students maximum flexibility and adaptability in their future employment and other aspects of life.⁶

The Hobart Declaration also signposted the future strengthening of outcomes-based curriculum and assessment. Given the special emphasis on documenting performance indicators, employment-oriented competencies, benchmarking and credentialling, it is not surprising that the curriculum climate became unfavourable to the pursuit of spiritual-moral aims – pupils’ personal development could not be articulated in such precise measurable outcomes. Hence spiritual-moral aims seemed to remain relatively nominal, espoused as important but having little influence on practice. This problem was exacerbated by the complexity of both personal development and its links with teaching and learning processes.

The prominence of business and labour executives on national education review committees from this time was something new (Finn Committee 1991; Mayer Committee 1992; Carmichael Committee 1992). It was a further indication that education was increasingly regarded as an instrumentality of government for improving national productivity on competitive global markets. And there was some danger that the notion of ‘educating the whole person’ could well take a back seat in curriculum development and implementation.

In a press release under the heading ‘Schools must teach values’ in September 2002, Commonwealth Minister Nelson launched the National Values Education Study through the Curriculum Corporation.⁷ His letter highlighted the principle that was to become central to the project; the focus was to be on ‘education ... delivered within a values-based framework’. While the study did contribute significantly to the national debate about spiritual-moral purposes to education, its principal contributions were in areas 2 and 3 as considered below.

Values education, like many of the constructs in Table 11.1, is limited in scope by comparison with ‘the spiritual-moral dimension to the curriculum’; promoting the development of values is not a large enough aim to cover this dimension adequately. Hence we prefer to use the latter (and phrases like ‘promoting young people’s spiritual and moral development’) as the most appropriate and comprehensive umbrella term. But this usage too is contentious; more needs to be done in the way of spelling out its meaning and curriculum implications if it is to become more prominent in Australian education. Teachers will notionally accept pupils’ spiritual and moral development as a desirable aim for education; they are not opposed to it, but they are not yet convinced of its practical relevance to public education.

Earlier normative curriculum documents referred to the aim of promoting young people’s *spiritual and moral development* (especially in New South Wales in 1990 and in *The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling* in 1999). The New South Wales statement (referred to in Chapter 1) is quoted again here as a most pertinent and provocative example. How the statement is interpreted, and especially how it might be implemented, will be a significant test case.

The moral, ethical and spiritual development of students is a fundamental goal of education. It is clearly not confined to one area of the curriculum. *All* teachers, across *all* areas of the curriculum have a responsibility to inculcate in their students positive values and a capacity for moral and ethical judgment.

Government schools should actively promote the moral values which are shared by the majority of people in our community. There is merit in the clear statement of this responsibility.

In particular, this document will give greater emphasis to the link between education, work and personal fulfilment, as well as encouraging imagination, creativity, excellence and the search for meaning and purpose in life. It will give more recognition to the place of the family and family values in our society and the rights and responsibilities of parents in the area of morals and values. Greater stress will be placed on students achieving high standards of self-discipline, personal conduct and social responsibility. As recommended ... the document will also acknowledge the importance of all students developing spiritual values.⁸

The statement, with parallels in more recent national documents,⁹ is something of an icon as regards the mandate for a spiritual-moral dimension to public education. But at the same time, it creates considerable problems for educators. It will remain little more than rhetoric if it cannot be translated into realistic, even if modest, practice. Addressing this question is the basic agenda of this book.

While we consider that the *spiritual-moral dimension to the curriculum* is the most extensive and useful construct for covering the personal development aims of education, it would be a mistake to use it (or any of the other terms in Table 11.1) exclusively. All of the listed terms highlight a distinctive aspect of personal development, even though they overlap. They are all personal and complex, and difficult to define. As far as their links with education are concerned, there is a natural ambiguity and uncertainty that is not there in education dealing with knowledge and skills. For this reason, it is important to continually clarify the discourse about the spiritual-moral dimension to education.

How to address this dimension to the curriculum has been approached in various ways. The National Values Education Study is one; most of the school projects it has sponsored revolve around promoting the common values listed in the national statement, as noted in **11.1.2** below. The approach proposed in this book is to explore a range of psycho-social issues that youth need to negotiate in meaning, identity and spirituality as they develop and mature as persons. This is not so much a list of potential personal development outcomes, but an agenda for student study and investigation – *and a prerequisite study of that same agenda by teachers*. A good education will at least inform young people about this agenda, with the hope that their educational engagement with the issues may eventually have a positive flow-on to their values, beliefs and attitudes. If and when personal change occurs, this will be the choice of the individual and not an automatic outcome of the educational process.

The other crucial matter to note yet again here is the evaluative dimension to promoting young people's spiritual-moral development. While the 'search' for meaning and identity is said to be important for young people, the potential for being 'overrun' with cultural meanings and identities needs to be addressed by cultivating critical evaluative skills.

11.1.2 Listing of core values for education (both the values underpinning education and the values it is hoped will be developed in pupils)

The construct 'values education' as a general term has two meanings: 'values in education' and 'education in values'.¹⁰ The former refers to the values that are embedded in the particular educational context, which influence both the content and process of the curriculum as well as the organisational structure and function of the school. The latter refers to classroom strategies for educating young people with respect to values (this is considered in **11.1.3** and **11.1.4**).

Ideally, there should be congruence between what the school 'teaches' about values and the values the pupils experience in the school's operation. At least to some extent, they can be socialised into community values in the school because they are affected by the way in which they are treated by teachers and fellow pupils; they can 'learn' values through a type of 'social osmosis'. Hence it is important that these values be articulated.

In 1991, in his book *Values education in Australian schools*, Brian Hill claimed that the potential influence of values in schools was not always properly acknowledged, and that when this happened, *negative values education* occurred – negative by default.

Apart from anything else they might learn, [school] students get the message that, in the things which it includes and excludes, the curriculum mirrors the priorities which the community sets on things such as personal worth, job preparation, 'the basics', 'the disciplines', the rights of minorities, and so on.

Values education goes on, therefore, even when we are not consciously planning for it. But when its effect is not acknowledged or controlled, the result is often that the wrong values for life are propagated by default. In schools where the emphasis is on learning subjects to gain good marks in order to beat others into higher education and better jobs, students are encouraged to develop a very self-centred and consumer-oriented value system.¹¹

Hill argued for efforts to humanise the unwritten curriculum – that is, to identify, appraise and make more positive the values implied in schools’ organisational life and curriculum.

Writing again on this topic in 2004, Hill acknowledged the significant progress that has been made in articulating core values for Australian public education. He drew attention to developments evident in State education department documents (values charters for schools),¹² to the cross-sectoral core values project in Western Australia,¹³ as well as to the 2002–03 (and ongoing) Commonwealth Values Education Study.¹⁴ Hill’s own individual contribution to this progress is noteworthy. All of this established the notion of ‘values in education’ more strongly in the Australian education discourse.

The statement of nine shared values listed in the National Framework for Values Education is included here.¹⁵ (The draft version of ten values, 2003, was restructured into nine in 2005.)

Table 11.2 Nine values for Australian schooling

<p>Nine values for Australian schooling (2005) These shared values, such as respect and ‘fair go’, are part of Australia’s common democratic way of life, which includes equality, freedom and the rule of law. They reflect our commitment to a multicultural and environmentally sustainable society where all are entitled to justice.</p>	<p>Notes referring to the 2003 draft list</p>
<p>1. Care and Compassion (Care for self and others)</p>	
<p>2. Doing Your Best (Seek to accomplish something worthy and admirable, try hard, pursue excellence)</p>	<p>Had been named as Excellence.</p>
<p>3. Fair Go (Pursue and protect the common good where all people are treated fairly for a just society)</p>	<p>Had been named as Social justice.</p>
<p>4. Freedom (Enjoy all the rights and privileges of Australian citizenship free from unnecessary interference or control, and stand up for the rights of others)</p>	
<p>5. Honesty and Trustworthiness (Be honest, sincere and seek the truth)</p>	<p>Trustworthiness was transferred from the earlier value Inclusion and trust.</p>
<p>6. Integrity (Act in accordance with principles of moral and ethical conduct, ensure consistency between words and deeds)</p>	<p>Previously named as Ethical.</p>
<p>7. Respect (Treat others with consideration and regard, respect another person’s point of view)</p>	
<p>8. Responsibility (Be accountable for one’s own actions, resolve differences in constructive, non-violent and peaceful ways, contribute to society and to civic life, take care of the environment)</p>	
<p>9. Understanding, Tolerance and Inclusion (Be aware of others and their cultures, accept diversity within a democratic society, being included and including others)</p>	<p>The earlier value Inclusion and trust was absorbed into Tolerance and understanding to give the new version.</p>

The government has required that all schools display a poster listing the nine core values.

While not taking away from the significance of this progress, the charting of core values for schools and the listing of personal development aims are simpler tasks than those needed for area 3, and especially for area 4, where the focus is on teaching and learning strategies and on content that might occasion personal change in young people.

11.1.3 Particular teaching programs in values, and in subjects like Ethics, Personal Development, Religion and Philosophy

In the National Project, two prominent examples were *Living Values Education*¹⁶ and *The Virtues Project*.¹⁷ Their attempt to educate young people in relation to values involved identifying values, understanding their influence on behaviour, and personal reflection. In turn, it was hoped that such study would foster change in values. The programs are usually located within the key learning area Study of Society and its Environment.

It is understandable that State and Commonwealth education authorities have felt more free to follow up on programs in values education than they would in a controversial area like religion – even though there are state-based Religion Studies courses. Values can be promoted in public education but there is ambivalence about the role of public education in promoting spiritual development, especially where this is interpreted in religious terms. Where the term ‘spiritual development’ is used with reference to public education, it usually refers to values and ethics, and only occasionally to spirituality – as long as there is no necessary link with religion.

It is their aim to promote personal change that values education programs have intentions in common with subjects like Personal Development, Sex Education, Philosophy, Ethics and Religion, even though the aim of religious development is more commonly associated with denominational religious education in independent schools.

What needs further clarification is the notion of ‘personal change or growth’ (and ‘spiritual and moral development’), which is both appropriate and realistic as a purpose for public education. If this is not done, then it will remain a nominal platitude in educational aims.

11.1.4 Across-the-curriculum strategies for promoting spiritual-moral development

The *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* signalled the following as a national education priority: ‘[That] teachers are provided with appropriate resources including professional development to support their efficacy as teachers of values within all areas of the curriculum and total school life and to monitor this efficacy on an ongoing basis.’¹⁸ The Commonwealth and State initiatives in values education have lifted the level of public and professional interest in the personal development purposes of education, as has the 2001 report of the Prime Minister’s Science Council.¹⁹

As noted in Chapter 1, it is not that some new ‘spiritual-moral pedagogy’ needs to be injected into the classroom; whether such a pedagogy exists is a matter for debate. What is needed is a conceptualisation of the ways in which teachers can address spiritual-moral dimensions in their regular teaching; and this needs to be both plausible and realistic if it is to win their support. This is a more difficult task than showing how particular subjects with spiritual-moral material as their prime content can affect pupils’ development (11.1.3). There remains a significant gap between purposes and practice as regards the personal development contribution of across-the-curriculum studies; this is mainly because of the natural ambiguity about how classroom teaching and learning actually affects pupils personally.

As far as ‘teaching’ values is concerned, the planning of lessons around the list of desired common values as topics is problematical, particularly from the point of view of students (12.3.1). This more ‘direct’ focus on values, which proposes the desirability of ‘being honest’, ‘caring’ etc., is perceived precisely as the intended ‘inculcation’ of values by adults and, understandably, it will be kept at some psychological distance. It is not so much a conscious defence against indoctrination or manipulation as a natural tendency in adolescents to resist being told what their values ought to be. Any overt educational intention to ‘change’ pupils personally is perceived as not respecting their freedom and individuality; any unarticulated or covert intention to do this is perceived as deceptive. The very phraseology for naming topics in values education, as well as the nature and organisation of content and resources, can have implied meanings about the intention to promote personal change that will prompt a negative response from students; a direct focus on values is therefore likely to be counterproductive.

By contrast, we consider it inappropriate to make *personal change* a prime objective of classroom studies. In the next chapters, we propose an alternative view where personal change is considered to be a *hope* that may eventuate from an activity where the prime objective is *educational*. This approach interprets personal change as a *secondary development* that may or may not follow from educational engagement; it implies an *indirect* focus on values that are naturally embedded in content. This approach is more appropriate psychologically, and more effective educationally, because it makes the educational engagement a student study or research activity dealing with issues rather than a perceived ‘exhortation’ to adopt the core values proposed for Australian schooling. This presumes the need for an open, inquiring and informative study, leaving the question of potential personal change off the agenda, and in the hands of the students themselves. Consistent with this approach, we propose that the constructs meaning, identity and spirituality can be very useful because they yield many relevant issues for across-the-curriculum studies – issues that the students will in all likelihood need to negotiate at some stage in their personal and social development.

11.2 Summary and conclusions: Where to from here?

The above analysis shows that real progress has been made in the first three areas we have discussed. Personal aims have been articulated, core values have been listed, and best practice in values education (in terms of school values charters and classroom values education strategies) has been explored. What is needed now is a strategy for consolidating what has been achieved, while addressing the gap between aims and practice that remains the most serious impediment to developing the spiritual and moral dimension to the school curriculum.

One useful way forward is to develop a theoretical scheme that takes all of the issues into account – a scheme that ‘works’ and that can give educators confidence both in the personal goals for education and in their pedagogical capacity to help young people move towards those goals (see Chapters 13 and 14).

Such a scheme needs to address three matters:

- 1 Complementing and extending the current interest in values education by conceptualising it within a broader notion of the spiritual and moral dimension to the school curriculum;
- 2 Reducing the problematic gap between personal aims for education and classroom practice;
- 3 Developing adequate theory and realistic strategies for promoting pupils’ personal development through across-the-curriculum studies.

11.2.1 Complementing and extending the current interest in values education by conceptualising it within a broader notion of the spiritual and moral dimension to the school curriculum

The Commonwealth Government selected values education as the key construct it would use to advance the personal agenda of education.²⁰ The Values Education Project has been a landmark development because of the national attention given to spiritual-moral concerns in Australian education. It was built on a study of best practice that helped avoid the problem of being too theoretical or too far removed from the classroom; it involved wide consultation in schools and community and it developed a set of principles and a framework to guide the planning and practice of values education in schools. The purposes of the project proposed in 2002 were achieved by 2003, and this achievement is ongoing. Without doubt, it has been a very successful program.

The question of where to go next to capitalise on the momentum generated by the Project was addressed in the 2003 Final Report’s first recommendation: ‘a suite of appropriate follow-up initiatives’ concerned with promoting further analysis of good practice and discussion of the draft set of core values to education, collection of resources, teacher professional development, and revising the national framework and principles for values education.²¹

Earlier we proposed that the idea of a spiritual-moral dimension to the school curriculum is ‘larger’ than what can be covered under the auspices of values education, and that the latter needs to be further contextualised within the former. Special attention also needs to be given to across-the-curriculum studies.

The Final Report of the Project (2003) noted how difficult it was to define values and values education, adopting definitions from its literature review:

Values: Values are ‘the principles and fundamental convictions which act as general guides to behaviour, the standards by which particular actions are judged as good or desirable’.²²

Values education: Values education refers to any explicit and/or implicit school-based activity to promote student understanding and knowledge of values, and to inculcate the skills and dispositions of students so they can enact particular values as individuals and as members of the wider community.²³

It also dealt with three ‘domains’ of values education: 1. articulating values in the school’s mission/ethos; 2. developing student civic and social skills and building resilience; and 3. incorporating values into teaching programs across the key learning areas.

What now needs consideration is how values education relates to the educational pursuit of other personal development components like moral development, spiritual and religious development and those listed in Table 11.1. The key to this task is their common concern with bringing about *personal change* in pupils; and this depends on the ways in which teaching and learning activities actually mesh with young people’s personal development processes. In turn, these considerations raise fundamental questions such as: ‘Can we intentionally “inculcate” or “teach” values in the classroom?’ ‘What are the possibilities and limitations for promoting any personal change in that context?’ This fundamental agenda is taken up in the next three chapters, which clarify the links between education and personal change.

11.2.2 Reducing the problematic gap between personal aims for education and classroom practice

The hiatus between personal development aims for education and classroom practice will be interpreted in the following terms: the complexity of personal development; naturally problematic links between teaching and personal change in pupils; and the lack of adequate theory to give teachers the confidence and scope to ‘teach for personal change’.

11.2.3 Developing adequate theory and realistic strategies for promoting pupils’ personal development through across-the-curriculum studies.

The need for a more realistic conceptualisation of the spiritual and moral dimension to the school curriculum applies particularly to across-the-curriculum studies; here, while not so much the case in studies like religion and values education programs, it is more difficult to see how the ordinary teaching and learning activities in the classroom can promote pupils’ personal development.

A common thread in the issues discussed in this chapter is the need for an adequate theory linking educational processes with young people’s personal development. While this book does not claim to solve the problem, it works in the direction of constructing a useful theory.

Notes

-
- 1 W Campbell et al. 1992, *Visions of a future Australian society: Towards an educatin curriculum for 2000 AD and beyond*, quoted in BV Hill 2004, *Exploring religion in school: A natinal priority*, p. 44.
 - 2 Curriculum Corporation 2003a, *Draft National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* (prepared for the Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training), p. 6.
 - 3 NSW Government 1957, *Report of the Committee Appointed to Survey Secondary Education in New South Wales* (the Wyndham Report), p. 40.

-
- 4 Listed here is a sample of state and Commonwealth education documents that illustrate the emergence of personal development terms used as goals for education: **[Graham, I've left these as sep paras but made them bullet points, because they seem pretty important. Not sure GOOD TO HAVE THEM ON SEPARATE LINES, BUT NO NEED TO BULLET THEM JUST AS THEY WERE]**
- Australian Education Council (& MYCEETYA) 1989, *Common and Agreed National Goals for Schooling in Australia* (the Hobart Declaration).
- Australian Education Council (& MYCEETYA) 1999, *The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-first Century* (the Adelaide Declaration).
- Curriculum Corporation 2003b, *Values Education Study: Final Report* (Prepared for the Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training), Curriculum Corporation, Carlton South Vic.
- Curriculum Corporation, 2003a, *Draft National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools*.
- NSW Government 1957, *Report of the Committee Appointed to Survey Secondary Education in New South Wales* (the Wyndham Report).
- NSW Government 1989, *White Paper on Curriculum Reform in Schools in NSW*.
- NSW Department of School Education 1991, *The Values We Teach*.
- Qld Committee for the Review of the School Curriculum 1994, *Report of the Review of the Queensland School Curriculum: Shaping the Future*, vol. 3.
- SA Department of Education 1991, *Common Knowledge*, 8–10.
- Victorian Ministry of Education 1988, *The Social Education Framework, P–10: Effective Participation in Society*.
- WA Curriculum Branch, Education Department of Western Australia 1985, *Social Studies K–10 Syllabus*.
- 5 Some books from the 1980s that promoted the idea of a holistic education at that time: H & D Dufty 1989, *Thinking Whole: The quest for a new educational paradigm*; T Lovat & D Smith 1990, *Curriculum: Action on reflection*, p. viii; H Beare 1989, *The Curriculum for the 1990s: A new package or a new spirit?*; G Boomer 1982, *Negotiating the Curriculum: A teacher–student partnership*; E Eisner 1982, *Cognition and Curriculum: A basis for deciding what to teach*.
- 6 Australian Education Council (& MYCEETYA) 1989, *Common and Agreed National Goals for Schooling in Australia*, p. 2.
- 7 B Nelson 2002, Schools must teach values (letter to *The Age* by the Commonwealth Minister for Education announcing the National Values Education Project).
- 8 T Metherell 1990, *Excellence and Equity: New South Wales curriculum reform*.
- 9 Australian Education Council (& MYCEETYA) 1999, p. 1; Curriculum Corporation 2003a, p. 6.

-
- 10 This distinction was highlighted in JM Halstead & MJ Taylor (eds) 1996, *Values in education and education in values*.
- 11 BV Hill 1991, *Values education in Australian schools*, p. 3.
- 12 BV Hill 2004, Values Education in Schools: Issues and challenges. Keynote address at the National Values Education Forum; BV Hill 2004, Core values in the balance. Keynote paper presented at the ACER national conference on Student Well-being, Adelaide. See also the references in note 2.
- 13 WA Cross-Sectoral Consortium 1995, *Agreed Minimum Values Framework*.
- 14 See references in note 4.
- 15 Department of Education, Science and Training, 2005, *National framework for values education in Australian schools*, p. 4.
- 16 www.interfaithstudies.org/ethics/valueseducation.html.
- 17 www.virtuesproject.com/virtues.html.
- 18 Curriculum Corporation 2003a, p. 6.
- 19 Prime Minister's Science, Engineering and Innovation Council, 2001, *Developmental Health and Well Being: Australia's Future*, http://www.dest.gov.au/science/pmseic/documents/Child_health. Accessed 5/1/05.
- 20 B Nelson 2002, p. 13.
- 21 Curriculum Corporation 2003b, p. 18.
- 22 Halstead & Taylor 2000, Learning and teaching about values: A review of recent research.
- 23 Curriculum Corporation 2003b, p. 8.