CHAPTER III

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
3.1 OVERVIEW

This chapter provides the conceptual framework of this study. It consists of six sections. The first is the overview of the entire chapter. The second gives different approaches to the development of values. The third outlines various models for developing values. The fourth gives an account of the content analysis of XI standard Tamil Text book with regard to Democratic values and dilemma situations generated by the researcher. The fifth section furnishes the description of Dilemma discussion model and the last one deals with the validation of the Dilemma Discussion Model in developing Democratic values at higher secondary level.

3.2 DEVELOPMENT OF VALUES - DIFFERENT APPROACHES

The development of values is a life long process. It covers the entire domain of learning - developing rational thinking, educating the emotions and training the will - the cognitive, affective and psycho motor domains. Many philosophers have pointed out that values cannot be taught but to be caught. According to Lawrence Kohlberg' (1970) there are six natural sequential stages (in three levels) of cognitive moral judgement - the pre conventional stage, when the child acts with a view to avoid punishment and obtain reward; the stage of conventional rule conformity, when child's behaviour is determined in terms of avoidance of disapproval/dislike of others and the stage of moral autonomy when the child is guided in his behaviour by his conscience.
and the principle of respect for the rights of others. At the last stage the individual’s judgement is based on self-chosen ethical principles. While the development of cognitive moral judgement is a natural process and it would occur even without education, suitable educational intervention can accelerate this development and help in reaching a higher stage than what the individual would reach without such intervention. The important implication here is that our strategies and approaches to value education should match the developmental stage of the individual.

J.R. Frankall (1977) proposed "Value Analysis System" which provides an opportunity to the students to develop moral reasoning and a way to analyse value position and come to some selected conclusions. The value analysis approach helps the students apply their scientific awareness, logical thinking and reasoning to decide on values.


(i) Teaching of values through suggestions:

The teachers’ attempt should be to suggest and persuade, not to command or to impose. The best method of suggestion is by personal example, in daily life and work and through books read from day-to-day.

(ii) Teaching of values through participation/experience:

School and college curricula should be enriched with curricular, co-curricular and extra-curricular
activities. These activities will have cultural, social and national impact on the minds at their formative stage. Participation in these activities will give students first-hand experience thereby deepening the sense of duty, social service, National outlook and humanism.

(iii) Teaching of values through example

Teaching of values through example

The demonstrative conduct and righteous way of living of the teacher is sure to inspire and stir the value consciousness of the students. Sushma Bhagia (1988) pointed out the following approaches to value education.

(i) Critical enquiry approach: Students should be furnished with a set of reasoning skills which they would then use in the real world. For example, a problem can be posed in the form of a dilemma of speaking the truth and putting someone in trouble. Such dilemma can be used for advantage, to open up a new line of thought, a principle or to raise questions about a particular viewpoint that has been taken for granted.

(ii) Total atmospheric approach: The school atmosphere, the personality and behaviour of the teachers, the facilities provided in the school are the main factors in the process of value development.

(iii) The integrated concurrent approach: The integrated approach is one in which problem or topics are the main focus of inquiry experience and action in school atmosphere. Units of study are centred on topics of every day school and out of school experiences such as friendship, reward and punishment
work and leisure etc. Each topic may be tackled through consideration of key questions, principles and concepts, review of a wide variety of concrete examples, gathering of relevant information etc. B.P. Lulla (1989) suggested three teaching techniques of value education.

(i) Integration of values in the text-curriculum

There are values implicit in various topics in all our classroom subjects. The teacher must bring out the value aspects that have direct bearing upon our day-to-day life.

(ii) Integration of values in co-curricular work

It includes activities such as games, debates, dramas and several other co-curricular activities that exist in any school. These activities should be given a value orientation.

(iii) Direct pedagogical inputs

Silent sitting, prayers, group singing, story telling, group activities like games and role plays are the direct pedagogical inputs. These techniques can be integrated into a regular class for education in human values.

To sum up, the value development process involves two types of strategies (1) Direct method (2) Indirect method. Indirect method involves various projects and activities through which values are developed. Morning Assembly, N.S.S, scouting, curricular activities, cultural activities etc should be so planned and executed effectively with a view to developing values. Direct method involves oral preaching, lecturing by teachers, telling stories with morals.
and narrating the biographies of greatmen etc. The classroom teacher should inculcate the desirable values among the students by his varied, effective and inspired method of instruction and by his moral behaviour.

Many researches have been conducted in India and abroad to study the effect of different kinds of educational interventions through the curriculum for the development of moral values. The researchers have used different models to stimulate the development of moral values.

3.3 MODELS FOR DEVELOPING VALUES

According to Richard H. Hersh, John P. Miller, Clean D. Fielding (1980) "A model of moral education in our conception, is a way of thinking about the process of carrying, judging and acting in an educational setting." A model includes a theory or a point of view about how people develop morally and a set of strategies, or principles, for fostering moral development."

The models furnish a broad-based pedagogy. Methods are presented to mobilize feeling, to guide thinking, and to sustain action. There are techniques designed to help students clarify personal interests and there are methods that equip students to negotiate complex international problems.

Joyce and Weil (1980) have identified 23 models which are classified into four basic families — information processing models, personal models, social interaction models and behavioural models.
Information Processing models such as Inquiry Training model (Hilda Taba & Richard Suchman), concept Attainment model (Jerome Bruner), Advance organiser model (Ausubel) aim at intellectual growth of the pupils rather than emotional or social development of the individual.

Personal Models such as non directive teaching model (Carl Rogers) and Classroom meeting model (William Glasser) are to develop the capacity for personal development in terms of creativity, self-concepts, self understanding and creative problem solving.

Behavioural Modification Models such as self control model (B.P. Skinner) Director Training Model (Gagne, Smith & Smith) where evolved from attempts to develop efficient systems for sequencing learning tasks and shaping behaviour by manipulating reinforcement.

Social interaction models such as Juris prudential (Donald Oliver James P. Shaver) Role playing (Fannis shaftel, George shaftel) emphasize the development of capabilities for interpersonal relationship. They focus on the social issues being resolved through academic inquiry and logical reasoning.

Shaver's Rationale building model emphasizes the teachers' need to understand the nature of Democratic society, the teacher's role in such a society and the nature of values. He is concerned with helping teachers build rationale for making educational decisions in general and for teaching the concepts and skills of democratic citizenship in particular. The teacher is to help the student develop a democratic frame for the identification, clarification, and analysis of values and value conflicts.

The main focus of The consideration model by Mc Phail, is on learning to understand other people's needs rather than on balancing those needs as they conflict. According to him, "A pupil learns more from what a teacher is and does than from what a teacher teaches." The consideration model places great emphasis on role playing, socio-drama and creative writing as methods for enhancing interpersonal awareness.

The value clarification model by Louis Raths, Merrill Harmin and Sidney Simon, is an attempt to help people decrease value confusion and promote a consistent set of values through a valuing process. The values clarifying process involves seven sub-processes.

Choosing : 1. Freely 2. from alternatives 3. after thoughtful consideration of the consequences of each alternatives.

Prizing : 4. Cherishing, being happy with the choice
5. willing to affirm the choice publicly.
Acting  
6. doing something with the choice
7. repeatedly in some pattern of life.

Value Analysis Model by Jerrold Coombs, Milton Meux and James Chadwick, provides a detailed step by step process for analyzing value questions, particularly those complex public policy issues.

1. Identifying and Clarifying the value questions.
2. Assembling purported facts.
3. Assessing the truth of purported facts.
4. Clarifying the relevance of facts.
5. Arriving at a tentative value decision.
6. Testing the value principle implied in the decision.

By engaging in these six procedures, the individual comes to a judgement based on strict standards of rationality.

The Social Action Model by Newmann discusses the importance of group discussion skills, various affective issues such as trust and commitment and the necessity for moral reasoning skills. He gives more attention to environmental competencies that sustain moral action. This Model recommends both course work and community involvement.

The cognitive Moral Development model by Lawrence Kholberg is mainly concerned with the development of moral reasoning. Kholberg has found that there are six sequential stages of moral development in three levels in all individuals.
1. The pre conventional level:
   Stage 1 - Punishment & Obedience Orientation.
   Stage 2 - Instrumental Relativistic Orientation.

2. Conventional level:
   Stage 1 - Interpersonal Concordance Orientation.
   Stage 2 - Law and order Orientation.

3. Post - conventional level:
   Stage 5 - Social Contract legalistic Orientation.
   Stage 6 - Universal ethical principles Orientation.

According to Kholberg, the individual's judgement at the last stage is based on self chosen ethical principles. While development of cognitive moral judgement is a natural process and it would occur even without education, suitable educational intervention can accelerate this development and help in reaching a higher stage than what the individual would reach without such intervention.

Bandura and McDonald (1963) in an experiment showed the significance of modelling in the acquisition of moral judgements. In their experiment, the age range of children was 5 to 11 years. They were first tested to see whether they were in the, "Moral realism" or "autonomous morality" stage according to Piaget's classification. In one experimental situation the children who observed an adult model express moral judgements contrary to the moral judgement style they had. Some of the children were reinforced (praised) for adopting the same style of judgement as the model, whereas
others were not reinforced and they simply observed. A third group had no contact with the adult model but were reinforced for making judgements counter to their usual mode of judgement. Results showed that the children who were exposed to the behaviour of the model, showed the most change - and it hardly mattered whether they were reinforced or not. Those who did not observe the model and were only reinforced showed small changes. This study implies that children are maximally influenced in their style of moral judgement by the behaviour of people they respect, much more than they are by reinforcement of their behaviour. Therefore, children should be exposed to mature models to learn moral judgements rather than being subjected to reinforcement of their behaviour.

According to Lindgren (1976) teachers should keep in mind that the approach "Do as I say, not as I do" is likely to have little influence because children are more likely to do what an adult does.

In 1985, Andre Schlaefli and his associates made a meta-analysis of 55 research studies of educational intervention designed to stimulate moral judgment. In these studies, three kinds of intervention have been tried:

1. Dilemma Discussion method.
2. Personality Development Approach and

Of these three approaches, the curricular approach did not seem to have any effect and the Dilemma
Discussion Method showed greater effect than the Personality Development Approach.

One of Kholberg's associates, Moshe Blatt (1975) conducted a set of studies demonstrating the usefulness of classroom discussions of moral dilemmas. Blatt's studies revealed that pupils improve in their ability to think at more comprehensive and empathic levels as a result of moral Dilemma Discussions through indirect teaching.

A further refinement of the Discussion method comes from the work of Marvin Berkowitz from Marquette University. He found that effective discussion requires flexibility and the use of indirect teaching strategies.

A major review by Stephan Thoma indicated that the Discussion method was consistently effective. He also found that there were some important characteristics to bear in mind in separating the effective methods from the ineffective ones. First, "time" was generally an important variable. 12 to 16 week courses were effective. Short term workshops, two-week units or one-short presentations were not. Second, he found that the Discussion Method worked well with all age groups from early adolescents to adults and generally the older students showed the greater and positive change. The meta-analysis of Andre Schlaefli in 1985 also revealed that the interventions longer than 12 weeks have no more impact than interventions of 3 to 12 weeks and less than three weeks tends to be ineffective.
Das R.C. (1991) also inferred from his experimental study, that Dilemma Discussion Model was found to produce significant positive effect on cognitive development of moral judgement.

Since the Dilemma Discussion Model was widely considered to be a more effective strategy for inculcating values and the educational interventions of 3 to 12 weeks were proved to be effective, the researcher decided that Dilemma Discussion Model with relevant modifications, could be tested on selected samples for a period of 12 weeks for developing Democratic values at higher secondary level.

3.4.1 CONTENT ANALYSIS

Since the present study aims to develop the Democratic values of students of standard XI using Dilemma Discussion Model, suitable Dilemmas related to Democratic values have to be selected from standard XI Tamil text-book. In order to find out the scope of democratic values as found in the text-book, the content of standard XI Tamil Text-book has to be analysed from the specific perspective of democratic values.

Content analysis according to Lindsey and Aronson (1975) is, "a technique used for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying specified characteristics of messages."

According to Stone (1964) "content analysis refers to any procedure for assessing the relative extent to which
specified references, attitudes or themes permeate a given message or document."

As the investigator has done the M.Phil research work on, "Identification of values in XII standard Tamil Text-book and value-orientation of XII standard students", it facilitated the investigator to identify the Democratic values in the XI standard Tamil-Text book. For this all the prose lessons and poems in the XI standard Tamil text were analysed and all the Democratic values that were stressed directly or indirectly were listed out. This list was sent to all the teachers who are teaching Tamil in higher secondary schools at Devakottai Educational district. After getting their responses, 24 Dilemmas were prepared from the content related to the Democratic values.

3.4.2 DILEMMAS

According to Das R.C.(1991) "a dilemma is a situation, argument or illustration based on the Key concepts of the curricular teaching lesson, in which one or more individuals are faced with a choice between two or more conflicting alternatives, each of which is desirable to some degree."

The content of each lesson or poem, the Democratic values incorporated in it and the dilemmas prepared were checked and counter checked with the help of higher secondary and college teachers and the faculty members of Alagappa University. The Dilemmas were prepared in accordance with Indian Socio-economic cultural conditions. The content
analysis chart, the Dilemmas and the Dilemma Discussions were given in Appendix B.

3.5.1 DILEMMA DISCUSSION MODEL

In the Dilemma Discussion Model, a situation or incident, involving a Democratic value dilemma is presented to the students for discussion. Each student is asked to say what he would do and why, if he were the central character in the dilemma. As the teacher listens to their views, he mentally classifies them into Kohlberg's stages and finds out at which stage of development they are at present. He then suggests some arguments pertaining to the next higher level of Kohlberg for the consideration of the students. The student is however told that there is no single best or correct solution to the dilemma and the student is not required to accept the teacher's views but consider it along with the various views given by other students and arrive at his own decision. The teacher takes the role of a discussant and leader or mediator rather than as an authority figure.

The Dilemma Discussion Model used by Das R.C (1991), Sansan wal (1990), Singh A.K(1992) has been modified and developed by the investigator, by analysing and combining the appropriate sequential steps as found in concept Attainment Model(CAM), Inquiry Training Model(ITM), Jurisprudential Inquiry Model (JIM) and problem Solving Model (PSM).

The detailed description of each phase and steps and the evolving of this model chart, is given below.
3.2.2 EVOLVING OF DILEMMA DISCUSSION MODEL CHART

PROBLEM SOLVING MODEL (PSM)

PHASE I. IDENTIFYING
1.1 A Problem situation
1.2 Orienting the problem
1.3 Occurring perplexity
1.4 Sensing the problem
1.5 Understanding the problem
1.6 Recognising the problem

PHASE II. ANALYSING
2.1 Defining the Problem
2.2 Survey of Preliminary materials
2.3 Knowing Problem conditions
2.4 Understanding the ideas in the problem
2.5 Analysing major variables
2.6 Locating crucial features
2.7 Studying the facts and clues bearing upon the problem

PHASE III. PLANNING
3.1 Determination of the solution to attain the goal.
3.2 Applying the experience and manipulating the general principles to solve a problem
3.3 Organising and connecting such items purposefully.
3.4 Formulating hypotheses
3.5 Arriving at definite hypotheses

PHASE IV. DOING
4.1 Evaluating each Hypotheses
4.2 Trial and Error.
4.3 Appearing of suggested solutions.
4.4 Making the best tentative explanation of Hypotheses
4.5 Deriving implications of suggested solutions.
4.6 Devolving the bearings of suggestions by reasoning.
4.7 Observation and experiment for its acceptance or rejection
4.8 Finding out the consistency of the solution with other established facts and principles

PHASE V TESTING
5.1 Verifying the conclusion.
5.2 Applying the accepted conclusion.
5.3 Testing the validity of the derived conclusion.

CONCEPT ATTAINMENT MODEL (CAM)

PHASE ONE
Presentation of Data and Indentification of concept
1.1 Teacher presents labelled examples.
1.2 Students compare attitudes in (+)ve and (-)ve examples.
1.3 Students generate and test hypothesis
1.4 Students state a definition according to the essential attributes.

PHASE TWO
Testing Attainment of Concept.
2.1 Students identify unlabelled examples as "Yes" OR "No"
2.2 Teacher confirms students Hypothesis, names concept and restates definition according to essential attributes
2.3 Students generate examples.

PHASE THREE
Data Gathering Experimentation
3.1 Isolate relevant variables hypothesize and test causal relationship.

PHASE FOUR
Formulating An Explanation
4.1 Formulate rules or explanations.

PHASE FIVE
Analysis of The Inquiry Process
5.1 Analyze Inquiry strategy and develop more effective ones.
JURIS PRUDENTIAL INQUIRY
MODEL (JIM)

PHASE ONE
ORIENTATION OF THE CASE
1.1 Introduce materials
1.2 Review facts.

PHASE TWO
IDENTIFYING THE ISSUES
2.1 Synthesize facts into
class public policy issues
2.2 Select one policy
issue for discussion.
2.3 Identify values and
value conflicts.
2.4 Recognizing factual and
definitional questions.

PHASE THREE
TAKING A POSITION
3.1 Articulate a position
3.2 State basis of position
in terms of social
value consequences of
the decision.

PHASE FOUR
EXPLORING THE STANCE(S)
PATTERNS OF ARGUMENTATION
4.1 Establish the point at
which value is violated
4.2 Prove the desirable or
undesirable consequences
of a position
4.3 Clarifying the value
conflict with analogies
4.4 Set priorities. Assert
priority of one value
over another

PHASE FIVE
REFINING AND QUALIFYING
THE POSITION
5.1 State positions and
examine a number of
similar situations.
5.2 Qualify positions.

PHASE SIX
TESTING FACTUAL ASSUMPTIONS
BEHIND QUALIFIED POSITIONS
6.1 Identify factual
assumptions and deter-
mine their relevance.
6.2 Determine the predicted
consequences and examine
their factual validity

PROPOSED DILEMMA DISCUSSION
MODEL (DDM)

PHASE ONE
CONFRONTATION WITH THE PROBLEM
1.1 Presentation of the moral
dilemma by the Teacher.
1.2 Review of facts of the
problem situation (How and
When the event occurred and
who caused it)

PHASE TWO
RECOGNIZING THE DILEMMA
SITUATION
2.1 Asking the students to
identify the point at
which value is violated.
2.2 Clarifying the value
conflict.

PHASE THREE
DISCUSSING THE PROBLEM IN
SMALL GROUPS.
3.1 Asking conceivable
alternatives
3.2 Asking possible conseque-
ces of each alternative
3.3 Asking evidence to support
each consequences.

PHASE FOUR
WHOLE GROUP DISCUSSION AND
TAKING A STANCE
4.1 Evaluation of desirability
of the consequences.
4.2 Asking to judge the best
alternative.

PHASE FIVE
DECIDING THE BEST SOLUTION
(alternative) FOR THE
DILEMMA SITUATION.
5.1 Select according to
the Teacher.
5.2 Select according to
the Committee.
5.3 Select according to
the Students.

STEP NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JIM</th>
<th>ITM</th>
<th>PSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.3 DILEMMA DISCUSSION MODEL SYNTAX

Phase One: Confrontation with the problem:

step 1: Presentation of the moral Dilemma.

step 2: Review of facts of the problem situation.

The teacher presents the dilemma to the class. After describing the dilemma, the teacher asks questions in order to help the students to review the facts of the problem situation. The teacher should ensure that all students have understood the dilemma. This "asking for facts", provides students with a solid factual base from which to draw their later conclusions.

The first step in the first phase of this model, is similar to the steps found in as follows:

Jurisprudential inquiry Model (JIM 1.1)

Concept Attainment Model (CAM 1.1) and

Inquiry Training Model (I.T.M. 1.2)

The second step of this phase is similar to

Jurisprudential Inquiry Model (JIM 1.2 and 2.1)

Inquiry training Model (I.T.M. 2.1 and 2.2) and

Problem Solving Model (2.3 and 2.7)

Phase Two: Recognizing the Dilemma situation:

Step 1: Asking the students to identify the point at which value is violated.

Step 2: Clarifying the value conflict.

During this phase, students are being asked to describe what has happened in the incident and to identify
the point at which value is violated. The question, "what is this incident about?" makes the student to sort out and identify what the value conflict is about? what is the disagreement? These steps of the second phase of this model is similar to the step 2.3 of Jurisprudential model and 2.6 of Problem Solving Model.

Phase Three: Discussing the problem in small groups

Step 1: Asking conceivable alternatives:

In order to conduct a meaningful discussion, the whole class is divided into small groups having 5 or 6 members in each group. The teacher puts the question before the class, what will you do to try to resolve the dilemma? what alternatives are open to you? In each small group one person is selected to act as chair person to keep the discussion focussed on the task at hand. Brain storm is done. Students are encouraged to think of as many ways as they can in this situation. All the ideas of the members are noted down by the chair person. This step is similar to the step 3.1 of Jurisprudential model and 4.3 of Problem solving model.

Step 2: In the next stage of this phase, students are asked to state the possible consequences of each alternative. Each alternative suggested is taken one by one to predict the possible consequences. For this the following questions are asked

(1) What may happen to you if you do each of these things?
(2) What may be long as well as the short range consequences?
(3) What may happen if these alternatives were to become reality?
(4) Who would be affected and how?
(5) What are the effects on future generation?

This step is similar to the step 3.2 of Jurisprudential Model and 4.5 of problem solving model.

Step 3: The last stage of this phase three is, asking for evidence to support the likelihood of each consequence occurring. This initiates the students to search for data which describes what happened in similar situations in the past.

While students meet in small groups, the teacher moves from one group to another, helping students to focus on the assigned tasks, to clarify their reasoning, to avoid arguing about the facts of the dilemma. This small group discussion maximize student to student interaction, generate thinking about a variety of reasons for supporting a particular position, create a supportive feeling within each group and set up the whole class discussion that follows.

This step is similar to the step 4.2 of Jurisprudential model and 3.1 of problem solving model.

Phase four: Whole group discussion and taking a stance

Step 1: Evaluation of desirability of the consequences.

Following the small group discussions, the whole group discussion is conducted. Chair persons from various groups report the positions and reasons given in their groups while other students challenge what they hear. This whole
group discussion gives students a chance to report the reasoning which supports their positions and to hear reasons given for other positions or different reasons given for the positions they have taken, to challenge these reasons, and to hear their own reasoning challenged. The process of stating, challenging, being challenged, defending, explaining, criticizing and comparing highlights the existence of a gap between one's own stage of reasoning and the reasoning at the next higher stage. Students become conscious of this gap and move to close it. In this stage, the teacher notes down all the alternatives and possible consequences stated from all the groups on the black-board. The immediate consequences for self and others and later consequences for self and others are also charted and noted on the black-board for each alternative of the dilemmas.

Then the students are made to evaluate the desirability of the consequences. They are asked to think whether each consequence is good or bad? To what extent would the lives and dignity of human beings be enhanced or diminished? (Moral Criterion) Would any law be broken? (Justice Criterion) To what extent does the society benefit or lose? (Social Criterion) Would the lives of human beings be endangered in any way? (Human Safety Criterion) What is the economical implication? (Economic Criterion) - for the society and the individual. This step is similar to the
step 3.5 of Problem solving model and the step 5.1 of Jurisprudential inquiry model.

step 2: Asking to judge the best alternative

When the class members have finished discussing the desirability of each consequence and have both stated their reasons and listened to the reasons of others for considering certain consequences either desirable or undesirable, the choices are ranked from most desirable to the least desirable by using the above mentioned criterion.

Then the students are asked to judge the best alternative in the light of the above discussion. This step is similar to the steps 5.2 & 6.2 of Jurisprudential Inquiry model and to the step 3.2 of concept attainment model and to the step 4.4 of problem solving model.

Phase five: Deciding the best solution for the Dilemma situation and closing the discussion

This step is similar to the step 6.2 of Jurisprudential inquiry model, step 5.1 of Inquiry training model and to the steps 4.6 and 5.1 of problem solving model.

In this phase students are asked "what do you think you should do?" Students summarize all the reasons given for the positions being considered and they choose individually the reason they now find most persuasive.

Probe questions facilitate movement from the lower to the higher stages of moral reasoning because it helps students
(i) to think in more generalizable terms
(ii) to develop broad societal perspective.
(iii) to look at all the sides of an issue.

As students discuss the merits and demerits of one reason over another, they engage in the type of thinking that facilitates cognitive moral development and thus decides the best solution for the dilemma situation and they are ready to act in that way in similar situations.

In this approach, the students identify the value conflict in the acting stage of the dilemma situation. They discuss and evaluate the alternative course of action along the consequences of these alternatives. This may increase their awareness of value conflict. They will realize that there are many different sets of criteria that can be used to evaluate the consequences of differing courses of action that they have now be exposed to from several points of view.

3.6 VALIDATION OF DILEMMA DISCUSSION MODEL (DDM)

The detailed description of Dilemma Discussion Model, the evolving of Dilemma Discussion Model chart and 24 dilemmas related to the Democratic values that were prepared from the content of XI standard Tamil Text-book, were sent to 12 experts of value education for scrutiny and to give guidelines and comments for the improvements of the Dilemmas situation and the Dilemma Discussion Model.
Experts opinions were received. Their comments and guidelines were given into due consideration. Some words in the Dilemma situation were replaced and some steps in the Dilemma Discussion Model were rearranged and it was ready to conduct experimental study.

A pilot study was conducted to confirm the effect of Dilemma Discussion Model (DDM) in developing the Democratic values at higher secondary level through the teaching of the selected units of their Tamil Text-book. For this pilot study, 20 boys (10-science group, 10 arts group) were randomly selected from S.M.S. Boys Hr. Sec. School, Karaikudi. Cattell’s culture fair intelligence test (CFIT) was administered to them. On the basis of their intelligence score they were equally divided into two groups. Personal value Questionnaire (PVQ) by Sherry & Varma was administered first to measure their value levels in different values. From this score, their democratic value score was tabulated. Then a separate Democratic value Scale (DVS) developed by the investigator was also administered to them (the detailed description of these two tools are given in chapter IV). The Democratic value scores from DVS was also tabulated. The mean and S.D scores of the two groups were found out. It confirmed the equivalency of the two groups.

Among the two groups, one group was taken as Experimental group and the other was control group. To the experimental group one third of the selected units in XIth
Tamil Text was taught through DDM. The content was taught in one period of 45 minutes duration and a dilemma related to the content was discussed in the next period using DDM. Thus 8 periods were used for content teaching and eight periods were used Dilemma Discussion. At the end of 16 periods (6 weeks duration), 8 dilemmas were discussed along with the content of the selected units of XI std Tamil Text for the experimental group. But for the control group, the selected unit was taught in 16 periods using the Traditional method of teaching.

At the end of this kind of treatment, the personal value questionnaire (PVQ) and the Democratic value Scale (DVS) were once again administered to the two groups. The post-test scores of the two-groups in these two scales (PVQ & DVS) were tabulated. The gain scores in Democratic values for both groups were statistically tested to assess the effect of the experimental treatment through Dilemma Discussion Model.

The analysis of Pretest over post test scores in PVQ and DVS of the two groups showed that there was a significant development in the democratic values of the Experimental group using the Dilemma Discussion Model while it was not in the case of control group using the Traditional method of teaching. Thus the effect of Dilemma Discussion Model in developing the Democratic values of students of standard XI through the teaching of Tamil-text was validated.

3.7. CONCLUSION: The next chapter IV provides the Plan and Procedure of the present study.