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Abstract

This study was an exploration of teachers’ perspectives on teacher value. The research questions guiding this study were concerned with (1) identification of values important to teachers, and (2) the importance of teacher value on teachers’ curriculum, teaching strategy, assessment, relationship with students, and classroom climate. The school characteristic (public or private), as well as the teachers’ gender, nationality, age and years of teaching experience were discussed. Thirty-two teachers completed the survey questions designed for the purposes of this study. The researcher collected teachers’ responses on the appointed day. The gathered data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 10.0 for Microsoft Windows. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize demographic information and teachers’ perspectives on teacher value. The findings of this study indicate that responsibility and enthusiasm are the two most important teacher values, and
teacher value is most important in teachers’ relationship with students and least important in assessment of the values and functions considered. This study suggests that teachers can recognize and clarify their values in order to improve students’ academic achievement.
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Background

Values are the roots of people’s thoughts and behaviors. They provide guidelines when people make choices or take actions. Values are also the standards and patterns that lead people toward satisfaction, fulfillment, and meaning, and are inevitably and universally apparent in all human experiences (Morrill, 1980). When a person wants to buy items, evaluate events, or set goals, such values affect the decision, even unconsciously. So behavioral motivations, judging criteria, attitudes, and visions come from a person’s own values. Values can be divided into moral values and amoral values, and all values are either instrumental or intrinsic (Shaver & Strong, 1982). All these varieties of values are tightly associated with people, and represent what people consider important in life.

Teacher value, for the purpose of this study, is defined as the set of values held by a teacher that is the essential beliefs or evaluating standards of teachers toward their work. It dominates the teacher’s thoughts and behaviors directly, and also influences students indirectly and intangibly. In students’ schooling life, what they learn is not only limited to knowledge and skill, but also includes building and modifying their own set of values. With a key role in students’ learning process, teachers have the obligation to emphasize and clarify their own values.
Teacher value and its importance are present in three main ways: (1) the instruction that the teacher implements, (2) the relationship that the teacher builds with students, and (3) the environment that the teacher creates.

In instruction, teachers have three major works -- curriculum, teaching strategy, and assessment. Before a class, teachers collect and organize the knowledge that they believe most important, select their preferred teaching styles, plan the activities, and then design the curriculum. In the process of designing, teacher value guides a teacher’s thinking and becomes the hidden curriculum that is unintended, unplanned, and associated with formal curriculum (Jackson, 1968; Shaver & Strong, 1982; Tonelson, 1981; Veugelers, 2000). Without awareness, teachers transmit their values to the students through curriculum. Teachers are also the leaders in the classroom. When they lecture, demonstrate and conduct activities, their values appear unwittingly in front of students. In addition, the techniques and standards that teachers use to solve conflicts between students also become opportunities for students to imitate their teachers’ values.

Assessment is another part of a teacher’s work that overtly presents the influence of teacher value. Boud (1990) addresses the importance of assessment to students by suggesting that students can walk away from bad teaching but are unable to walk away from bad assessment. For the
researcher’s experiences, teachers’ different and unfair evaluative criteria may negate students’ efforts and reverse students’ judgments. In contrast, teachers’ identical and fair evaluative criteria will make students see grades as indices of their efforts in school work. Given the importance of assessment of student performance, teachers are responsible for building their values in such a way as to separate personal feelings toward specific students from assessment, and providing all students with fair and clearly articulated assessment criteria.

The second way that teacher value is apparent is in the relationship teachers build with students. Teachers are both the counselors and the friends of students, whether inside or outside the classroom. Students share their feelings and experiences with teachers, and ask for teachers’ help when they have problems. This is the most direct way that teacher value functions. Teachers must have the awareness that their own values affect students unconsciously through counseling, communicating, or just in common chatting.

The third way that teacher value is present is in the classroom environment. According to Albert Bandura’s concept of reciprocal determinism and the conceptual framework of classroom environment developed by Moos, the teacher is the core interacting domain (McAulay, 1990). Teachers are more influential because they take the dominant
position in a classroom. They establish the regulations, control the physical features, and also establish the climate. The teacher value that guides teachers’ thoughts and behaviors will affect their demonstrations in the classroom. Therefore, the environment that a teacher conducts and manages will reflect what the teacher values.

Whether in traditional learning, distance learning or whatever instructional strategy practiced, teachers play the pivotal role in students’ learning process. Teachers’ positions are significant because, not only they are the medium of education for students, but also they affect students directly. Teachers have manifold duties. In addition to information providers, teachers are also role models, facilitators, assessors, planners, and resource developers (Harden & Crosby, 2000). How they think, behave, and speak will influence students deeply and throughout the students’ lives. Thus, discussing the importance of teacher value is necessary for teachers to clarify their values and to become the model of students.
Literature Review

Teacher value is the set of values that teachers hold toward education. It affects teachers’ thoughts and behaviors in planning, decision-making, demonstration of leadership, as well as the interaction with students. Since values have such critical effects on teachers, it is necessary to understand the theoretical evolution and research of value theory while exploring the literature of teacher value. This overview of literature comprises three sections. The first section describes the literature on value theory. The second section describes the relationship between values and education, with more detail on schools and teachers. The third section summarizes research regarding the effect of teacher value on teachers’ work, including curriculum, teaching strategy, and assessment.

Value Theory
Definition

Many theories of valuation are developed, and values have been defined in many ways in the past five decades. There are three general definitions concluded by historical literature: people’s needs and wants, valuing process, and standards and criteria of people’s behaviors.
1. Values are people’s needs and wants. Lasswell (1951) asserts that values, for individuals or groups, are reflections on what is worthwhile, important and desirable. Lasswell believes there are eight universal values that describe all needs and wants of human beings and permeate the lives of all people. These eight value categories are respect, wealth, power, enlightenment, skill, rectitude, well-being, and affection. Lasswell believes these eight value categories can provide a holistic framework for understanding the value system of individuals, economics, politics, and society. The Lasswell value model is not a set of norms, suggested by Silver (1976), but a framework of continuum categories based on multi-cultural, psychological, and historical studies. Other researchers also define values as people’s basic needs and wants (Maslow, 1954; Silver, 1976). Silver (1976) indicates that values not only come from or exist in people’s needs and wants, but also reflect the preferred events that people seek.

2. Values are valuing processes. Raths, Harmin, and Simon (1966) define values as the results of a valuing process, and also maintain that values constitute the ideas, ideals and beliefs that guide an individual’s or group’s behaviors. They believe that how people arrive at their values is more important than what values people hold. So they center their attentions on the valuing process, rather than defining
the contents of values. In order to distinguish values from human experiences and behaviors, and to find out the genuine values in human life, Raths, et al. (1966) and Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum (1978) mention three active processes that people have to go through before holding a value: prizing one’s beliefs and behaviors, choosing one’s beliefs and behaviors, and acting on one’s beliefs. They also provide seven criteria that are related to these three processes:

Prizing one’s beliefs and behaviors
(a) Value will be prized and cherished
(b) Value will be publicly affirmed

Choosing one’s beliefs and behaviors
(c) Value must be chosen freely
(d) Value must be chosen after thoughtful consideration of the consequence
(e) Value must be chosen from among alternatives

Acting on one’s beliefs
(f) Value is incorporated into actual behavior
(g) Value is acted with consistency and recurrence

3. Values are the standards or criteria of behaviors. The more general definition of values is the standards or criteria that guide human behaviors. Rokeach (1973) mentions that
values are enduring beliefs and internal criteria for maintaining attitudes, guiding actions and making judgments. Rokeach believes values themselves are not attitudes. He asserts people have thousands of attitudes, but only have several values. Inspired by the definition of Rokeach and Fraenkel (1973) states that values reflect what a person considers important in life. He affirms that values are ideas as to what is good, useful, or desirable, and what is worth having, doing, and striving toward. Values are the standards used when people evaluate events.

Morrill (1980) defines values as the standard and pattern that lead people towards satisfaction, fulfillment, and meaning, and they are inevitably and universally present in all human experiences. Values are not specific things, behaviors or beliefs, but are the guides that direct people in taking actions and making decisions. Shaver and Strong (1982) concur with many researchers’ definitions of values, and mention that values are people’s standards and principles for judging worth. In addition, values provide criteria for people to judge events to be desirable, good, and worthwhile; or, on the other hand, to be despicable, bad, or worthless. They suggest that values are both affective and cognitive. Values are affective when they connect to feelings and emotions, and are cognitive when they deal with intellectual abilities, knowledge and skills. Johanneson (1996), in his book of “Ethics in Human Communication,” also asserts that
values are conceptions of the good or the desirable. Values both motivate human behaviors and provide criteria when people make choices or judgments.

Some researchers also define values in terms of society. Kluckhohn (1951) describes values as social rules that influence both individual and group decisions. Rokeach (1973) claims that values are the determinants of social behavior. Similarly, Hogan (1973) mentions that values are the standards or rules of a society, and values consist of both the abstract noun (e.g. honesty, justice) and the specific noun (e.g. virtue, laws).

Other definitions of values are also described in historical literature. Values can be defined to be the people’s performance. Rescher (1969) claims values as a cluster of people’s disposition, and asserts that values can be viewed as objects and behaviors. Values are also the eternal or universal truths (Kniker, 1977; Nelson, 1973). Kniker (1977) views values as the permanent truths, transmitted by parents and teachers for generations.
Type of Values

Values can be viewed from many different perspectives. Many theorists and practitioners of value theory categorize values in order to explore value systems. These researchers believe studying the types of value can help people clarify their values and find the ways to arrive at their values.

Lasswell (1951) presents a framework of universal values and divides all people’s needs and wants into eight value categories. Lasswell believes this framework can help people understand their own value system more clearly, and believes these eight values can be found everywhere and anytime in people’s lives. They are:

1. Respect values. These values refer to one’s capacity for recognition or discrimination, for example, concern for country, friends, or self.
2. Wealth values. These values are the desires to provide people’s needs and improve efficiency and productivity.
3. Power values. These values relate self to group, and to leadership and followership of people.
4. Enlightenment values. These values center in improved abilities in solving problems, including identifying problems and mastering solving techniques.
5. Skill values. These values refer to the development of potential in intelligence, social relationship and community.
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6. Rectitude values. These refer to the concerns and responsibilities of people in association with others.
7. Well-being values. These values refer to the health of people, and to attitudes about physical activities.
8. Affection values. These are feelings (e.g. love, like) toward self, and toward in others, group, and society.

Rokeach (1973) one of the most significant researchers to investigate values, categorizes human values into 36 items and divides these values into two categories by purpose: terminal values and instrumental values (Table 1). Terminal values refer to the desired goals of people, whereas instrumental values come from the modes of behavior that are designed to influence or achieve terminal values. For example, the people who choose true friendship as a terminal value might correspondingly choose the instrument values of helpfulness, honesty, love and politeness.
Table 1. Rokeach’s Type of Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental Values</th>
<th>Terminal Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ambitious</td>
<td>1. A comfortable life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Broadminded</td>
<td>2. An exciting life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capable</td>
<td>3. A sense of accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clean</td>
<td>5. A world of beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Forgiving</td>
<td>7. Family security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Imaginative</td>
<td>10. Inner harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Independent</td>
<td>11. Mature love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Logical</td>
<td>13. Pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Obedient</td>
<td>15. Self-respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Responsible</td>
<td>(approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Self-controlled</td>
<td>17. True friendship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Wisdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to the different fields of human activities to which values apply, Presno and Presno (1980) mention nine types of values:

1. Ethical values. These values are expressed in terms such as honest, sincere, genuine, and they are used to evaluate self, others, and specific events.
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2. Economic values. These values refer to concepts such as scarcity or worthiness of things, and are described and evaluated in monetary terms: expensive, costly.

3. Social values. These values relate to roles and norms of people in groups, including duty and responsibility. Valuative terms may include dutiful, anomy.

4. Psychological values. These values deal with feeling, attitude, and motivation of people. Personal emotions may include interesting, listless, motivated.

5. Social-ethical values. These values relate to group decision-making, group improvement, group involvement and identity. Terms such as independence, freedom, and coercion may be used to evaluate an event.

6. Aesthetic values. These values are the enjoyment of beauty or special quality in things. Aesthetic terms include: imaginative, mediocre, or beautiful.

7. Poetic values. These values are expressed in terms such as literary, metaphorical or literal.

8. Technological values. These values deal with relation, structure or system, and may be evaluated in terms like operative or mechanical.

9. Legal Values. People who hold these values focus on rules and principles when they evaluate other people or events. Terms such as lawful or constitutional are usually used.

For additional clarity, Presno and Presno divide these nine values into three areas: person, group, and thing (Table 2).
Table 2. Presno and Presno’s Types of Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied to person</th>
<th>Applied to group</th>
<th>Applied to thing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical values</td>
<td>Social-ethical</td>
<td>Aesthetic values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>Social values</td>
<td>Poetic values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values</td>
<td>Legal values</td>
<td>Economic values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal values</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technological</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shaver and Strong (1982) provide another productive schema for educators to clarify and classify their values. They divide values two ways. First, values are divided into “moral” and “amoral” values. Moral values, as Shaver and Strong explain, are the standards or principles that people use to judge the rightness or goodness of their aims and actions. Honesty, patriotism, and freedom of speech are moral values. Amoral values include aesthetic values and performance values, which both guide and affect people’s decisions. Aesthetic values are the standards when people judge “beauty.” These values refer to nature, music, art skills and personal appearance. In pedagogy, aesthetic values usually relate to curriculum and classroom routine. Performance values are the standards used to judge the performance or competence of people or events. Commonly, performance values are used by educators to evaluate teachers’ or students’ performances.

Second, Shaver and Strong divide values into “intrinsic” or “instrumental” values. Intrinsic values, as “end values” (Rescher, 1969) or as “terminal values” (Rokeach, 1973), are
the values that people want to reach at the end state. World peace, equality, and salvation can be called intrinsic values. Instrumental values are the standards used to achieve other standards, for example, teachers set a standard of keeping quiet in the classroom to enhance student learning.

Therefore, in Shaver and Strong’s schema of value (Table 3), values are divided into moral and amoral values; there are two types of amoral values, aesthetic and performance; moral and amoral values can also be intrinsic and instrumental. Educators can place their values in this schema, and ponder the attributes and purposes of these values. By using this schema, educators can ensure that their standards of evaluating students are not unreasonable, but are built with deliberation.

Table 3. Shaver and Strong’s Schema of Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( Amoral = Aesthetic + Performance )

Values in Education

Many researchers who study values assert that there is a close relationship between values and education (Barth, 1994; Butler, 1970; Champion, 1990; Dreeben, 1968; Kniker, 1977; McLaughlin, 1994; Morrill, 1980; Shaver & Strong, 1982). Dewey (1916) connects values with the curricula and aims of education. He asserts that value has two different meanings. First, to value means to appreciate, that is, to prize something and find its essential worth. Second, to value means to evaluate, to make judgments or comparisons. Chandler (1963) notes that the diversities in feelings, attitudes, and convictions of people complicate the aims of education. So Chandler believes such aims of education are predicated upon people’s values. Butler (1970) also maintains there is an essential and close relationship between values and education, and offers four explanations:

1. Butler supposes the people must realize and practice values before they achieve and enjoy these values. In addition, no matter what essence the value has, the process of value realization is educative and it will help people grow and develop.

2. Butler thinks school is a unique institution in society, in that school is more a value-realizing institution than any other institution. Butler maintains that schools have the responsibility to conserve values, conform each new generation in culture and society, and to preserve the values that the society already holds.
3. Butler connects values with education in educational objectives as well, no matter who proposes the objectives, and how specific these objectives are, values are implicit in these educational objectives.

4. The fourth aspect of the relationship between values and education is in importance of students’ own value problems and decisions. Butler thinks making value judgments and decisions is essential to education. Teachers have to avoid making decisions for their students and rescuing them from difficult decisions. If students can practice making value judgments, then they will have the abilities to face the demands and problems of life. In these conditions, Butler says, students’ value experiences become educational.

Veugelers (2000) also believes education goes beyond the transformation of knowledge and skills to the development of values. He notes educational concepts, such as value education, moral development, critical thinking, and critical pedagogy, which deal with values in education.

Values with School

Many researchers described the role of school in the relationship between values and education. Some focus on the values that a school holds, and the manner in which school organization and structure influence the values of students (Grannis, 1967; Presno & Presno, 1980; Silver, 1976). Grannis (1967) claims that what the students really learn in school are the organizational values such as authority,
order, routine and efficiency. Schools have the obligation to improve students’ individualization, self-development, and personal relationship. Dreeben (1968) also points out that the values students acquire from their school experiences will assist their integration into the competitive, vocational and political worlds of adult. Furthermore, Silver (1976) details the influential elements of schools: principals, teachers, administrative personnel, peer group, school regulations, and cultures. Additionally, Shaver and Strong (1982) note that values are implicated in the interaction between students and school personnel: the principal, school secretary, teachers, or lunch worker.

Some researchers assert that school has to play the active role in transmitting values to students (Butler, 1970; Kniker, 1977; Lickona, 1991; Morrill, 1980; Taylor, 1995). Butler (1970) advocates that schools cannot withhold value consideration or force value decisions; in contrast, schools must provide opportunities for value consideration, decision, and realization. Silver (1976), in his book of “Value Education”, writes that personal and social problems within our society come from value confusion, and maintains that schools must help students identify and clarify their values. He suggests that schools can create opportunities within the curriculum for students to make choices and decisions in all areas of human activities. Morrill (1980) also contends that schools have the undeniable responsibility for developing
their students’ academic values. He names implicit and explicit ways, such as the school’s mission statement, systematic classroom discussion, curriculum program, statement of right and obligation, workshops, or the language of the principal, which can help students to develop their values.

Other researchers disagree, claiming schools or teachers cannot directly transfer values to students because students construct their own concepts and develop their own values (Champion, 1990; Giroux, 1989; Prawat, 1992). Teachers can themselves be exemplars, encouraging students to develop personal values of honesty, respect, responsibility and compassion.

In recent years, more researchers have acknowledged that school is more important in standing for, reflecting and impacting students’ values (Campbell, 1997; Lickona, 1991; Wynne & Ryan, 1993). Champion (1990) suggests that a poor environment can cause youth a loss of values. Such youth lack direction for their lives and lack criteria for deciding what to do with their energy and time. The school, Champion says, as the locus of socialization for youth into society, actually has the responsibility to lead and direct students’ values in the right way. But a school’s strength alone is not enough, Barth (1994) suggests. Both parents and society have to work together in order to give students a good environment for their growth and development of values.
McLaughlin (1994) addresses the importance of teachers and schools in student’s value development. He believes values are inescapable in education. Teachers cannot escape values by attempting to be neutral; and all aspects of school, such as the organization, management, physical appearance or culture, contain the value application and transmit the values to students. In addition, McLaughlin mentions five complexities of values in education:

1. Variety. Values in education have many kinds and styles; all of them related to many aspects of the educational process. This diversity makes it difficult to speak of values in a sweeping or general way.

2. Structure and grounding. Values are not isolated from each other, but related in structural ways. People also view values from different perspectives. Some people regard values trivially because they are merely a person’s preference; but others take values seriously because they are intrinsic beliefs or purposes.

3. Relatedness to practice. Values must be realized and practiced; they cannot only exist on paper or just in the mind of people. But because of the permeability of values, it is difficult to isolate the practice of one value from the practice of another in clear ways.

4. Conflict. Not all values are mutually consistent. Sometimes the values conflict with each other and one cannot judge which is priority (e.g. the conflict between freedom and equality).
5. Authority in deciding. Government, community, principal, teachers, parents, and the mechanism of the educational system are seem to have the same authority, but not clear and certain, to determine values. The process of determining values creates yet another obstacle in value practices.

McLaughlin provides four methods to practice values in education: achieving an overall perspective, identifying the scope of diversity and argument in values, conceptualizing the moral task of the school, and identifying the scope of diversity in schooling.

Values with Teacher

Many who have studied values in education have focused on the role of teacher (Barr, 1971; Giroux, 1989; Prawat, 1992; Ryan, 1993; Shaver & Strong, 1982; Simon, Howe, & Kirschenbaum, 1978). Barr (1971) maintains that teachers deal with values in two ways. First, teachers indoctrinate the values that are well considered, well established, and widely accepted to students. Harmin and Simon (1971) also provide some methods, such as moral approach, reward and punishment approach, manipulative approach, and explanatory approach that teachers use when they inculcate values. Second, says Barr, teachers try to be value-neutral. Silver (1976) advocates teachers taking the active instead of the passive role in students’ value
development. He maintains teachers have to provide opportunities and experiences for students in formulating, clarifying and building their personal and social values. The strategies and activities suggested include supplying curriculum materials, organizing time, giving direction, conducting discussions and facilitating interactions. Teachers also have to encourage students to analyze conflicting values and make value judgments.

Wilson and Gaff (1975) studied the relationship between faculty and students. He investigated 407 faculty members and 1,127 students. A large number of students indicated that faculty members improved students’ values. Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum (1978) put their focus on the values that teachers hold. They think the common way that people learn their values is from modeling. Teachers, living with students almost day by day, become one of the important resources as students learn their values. So Simon, Howe and Kirschenbaum believe teachers’ thoughts and behaviors reflecting their own values are influential in students’ value development.

Shaver and Strong (1982) also stress the importance to students of the values that teachers hold. They believe teachers affect students’ values implicitly through the choices of content, instructional method and interaction with students. Teachers cannot avoid teaching with values. In Shaver and Strong’s category of amoral value, teachers use their performance values
to evaluate students’ performance. In addition, teachers use their aesthetic values, such as keeping the classroom neat and orderly or pleasant surroundings, to regulate their classrooms. Furthermore, teachers set their intrinsic values, that is, values inherent in teaching, to cultivate students’ interest and improve performance. The relationship between values and teachers, as Shaver and Strong advocate, is close and important.

Teacher Value

Teacher value, as the set of values that teachers hold, influences teachers’ work toward education. Curriculum, teaching strategy, assessment, relationships with students, and classroom climate, all reflect the teacher value and are the names by which teacher value affects students’ perceptions, opinions, and their own values.

Effect of Teacher Value on Curriculum

The word “curriculum” comes from Latin, which means the race course. Wynne (1937) defines curriculum as the main factor of the educative process, and it consists of the subjects to be studied. Good (1959) asserts that curriculum consists of specific materials of instruction for helping students enter the professional or vocational field. English (2000) studies the relationship between curriculum and teachers. He contends that curriculum defines the work of teachers, and includes the content to be taught and methods to be used by teachers.
Many researchers maintain that teachers are very important to curriculum (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Cranston, 1998; Harden & Crosby, 2000; Miller, 1990; Schubert, 1992). Connelly and Clandinin (1988) think teachers play the most important role in curriculum planning and development because the teachers’ personal conception and knowledge will affect curriculum differences. Miller (1990) calls teachers “curriculum creators.” Creating the curriculum provides the opportunities for teachers to interact, teach, interpret, and question students in a reciprocal manner. Schubert (1992) likewise, asserts that teachers make and plan curriculum every moment of their daily work. Cranston (1998) calls teachers “curriculum leaders.” They lead in designing, implementing, and modifying curriculum. Harden and Crosby (2000) point out that curriculum planning is an important work for the teachers, as they integrate their ideas, knowledge, and experiences. The process of planning curriculum is a significant challenge requiring dedicated time.

Leese, Frasure, and Johnson (1961), in his book, “The Teacher in Curriculum Making,” talks about the importance of the teacher’s individual value system in developing curriculum. Leese et al believe the different value systems of individuals will help people view things from different angles, and this is why teachers have to be aware of their value systems when they design curriculum, inherent with their
own convictions, objectives, and goals in education. Kearney (1958) states that the goals and objectives teachers set will reflect the teachers’ value system. Raths, Harmin, and Simon (1966) also point out that goals, purposes, beliefs, and convictions are value indicators, and while they may not present all the teacher value, they do indicate what the teacher values are. Elbaz (1981), observing a teacher, Sarah, describes how Sarah was unhappy in some teaching situations and how she created other teaching situations that made her feel better. Elbaz concludes that Sarah’s behaviors did not come from her knowledge of values but come from her values. Sarah did not say she held certain values, but her behaviors completely reflected her values. Connelly and Clandinin (1988) discuss the idea of personal philosophy in their book “Teachers as Curriculum Planners,” maintaining that teachers present their personal philosophy, that is, their value sets, in planning and discussing curriculum.

The structure of curriculum also reflects the importance of teacher value. Tyler (1950) maintains the three categories in organizing curriculum materials are “concept,” “values,” and “skills, abilities, and habits.” Regarding “values,” teachers have to think and decide what major values are embedded in these materials, or what major values these materials might apply to. Teacher value is present clearly when teachers organize the materials in curriculum. Many researchers mention hidden curriculum as the way that
teacher value affects students (Eisner, 1979; Shaver & Strong, 1982; Silver, 1976). Eisner (1979) points out that schools teach three curricula: the explicit, the implicit, and the null curriculum. The implicit curriculum, the hidden curriculum, consists of all the materials that are taught even though teachers do not set out to do so. This curriculum reflects teachers’ values and attitudes, and sometimes may be negative if teachers do not notice it. The way for teachers to make hidden curriculum helpful, as Connelly and Clandinin (1988) suggest, is to notice the meta-message in teaching. English (2000) also introduces three different types of curriculum. The informal curriculum, one of these three types of curriculum, represents the unrecognized aspect of curriculum planning, corresponding to the hidden curriculum of Eisner. It reflects the teacher value in selecting the content, and also in delivering this curriculum.

Effect of Teacher Value on Teaching Strategy

Many researchers studying the relationship between teacher value and teaching assert that teacher value is a determinant of successful teaching (Kash & Borich, 1978; Kearney, 1958; Mazer, 1971; Steward & Steward, 1973; Veugelers, 2000). Kearney (1958) believes good teaching comes from the teacher’s value system, and the ways of being good teachers are keeping what and how teachers do valuable in the educative process. Raths, Harmin, and Simon (1966) mention that the attitudes and feelings teachers reveal, the
worries teachers have, and the activities teachers conduct will indicate the teacher value. Through implicit ways, teacher value affects students by what teachers do in the classroom.

In 1971, Mazer found through an experiment that the teacher’s value about socioeconomic status affected his expectations of students’ performance. Mazer provided several backgrounds and instructional situation photographs of students for teachers, accompanied with simple descriptions of these students’ socioeconomic status. These students include black and white, male and female students. Mazer switched these photographs among the socioeconomic status descriptions, and asked teachers to make predictions of these students’ performance. Results of this experiment showed that the teacher value about these students’ socioeconomic status, rather than race or gender, determined their predictions of student performance. Teachers’ backgrounds and experiences did not influence their predictions clearly in this experiment.

Steward and Steward (1973) also show the importance of value in teaching style by examining the maternal teaching style in different ethnic groups. They videotape mothers’ instruction to their three-year-old sons, recording the input, pacing, mothers’ alertness, teaching formats, children’s responses, mothers’ feedback and the interactions between them. Steward and Steward analyze the results and conclude
that the mothers’ values of ethnicity are obviously present in their teaching styles and the children’s responses.

In recent years, many researchers assert teachers are leaders in the classroom (Livingston, 1992; Pellicer & Anderson, 1995; Walling, 1994). Teachers deliver the curriculum, implement the pedagogical strategies, lecture, conduct activities, and manage classroom behaviors. Veugelers (2000) stresses more clearly that all teachers will always express their values in teaching. Kash and Borich (1978), in their book “Teacher Behavior and Pupil Self-concept,” assert: “It is the teachers’ value that determine their success not only as disciplinarians, model citizens, and therapists, but also as significant/salient others” (p. 46).

Effect of Teacher Value on Assessment

Teacher value also affects the assessment in classroom. Assessment, defined by Airasian (1997), is the process of collecting, evaluating, and interpreting information to help teachers make decisions. From assessment, teachers can measure students’ performance and find out what are the students’ weak fields in which they can make improvement. McMillan (2001a) mentions that classroom assessment includes four essential components. The first one is purpose: teachers have to decide and value what is the goal of the assessment. The second component is measurement: teachers have to decide what technique or style is appropriate for them.
to use in the assessment. Third is evaluation: teachers must set up criteria or standards before the assessment, and interpret the results when they gather all the information. Teachers’ professional judgments play a key role as they determine good or bad student performance. The fourth component of assessment is use: teachers have to decide how they use the results. According to McMillan, teacher value deeply influences the content and style of assessment. The goal teachers set, the standard teachers build, and the judgment teachers make, will indicate what the teacher values are (Raths, Harmin, & Simon, 1966).

In the historical literature on the assessment of students, some controversial issues that relate to teacher value are widely discussed. The first issue is about assessment itself. Some researchers argue that assessments of students correlate with the teacher’s personal cognition of students (Axelrod, 1973; Panuska, 1975). These researchers think teachers cannot divorce their personal opinions or feelings from assessing student performance, particularly as teachers refer to the students’ efforts, class participation, desire to learn, and progress in making assessments. Other researchers argue that there is an impersonal relationship between the teachers and students’ work when teachers are assessing (Cross, Frary, & Weber, 1993; Terwilliger, 1971). These researchers believe teachers’ assessments of students depend on the standards, that is, teachers assess student performance only based on the
symbol on the answer sheet. These two different conceptions are “artificial distinction,” says Weis (1999), and they confuse teachers in making the assessments (p. 227).

The purpose of assessment is another controversial issue that is widely discussed by researchers. Some researchers argue that teachers have to be forward-looking, that is, teacher’s purpose of assessment is to inspire and encourage students in academic performance (Brookfield, 1990; Dreyfuss, 1993). But other researchers argue that teachers have to be backward looking, that is, teachers should assess and give students what they deserve (Terwilliger, 1971). The results of assessment have an impact on the lives of students (Cunningham, 1998). No teacher wants to hurt the students’ self-esteem or self-worth, but all teachers want to stimulate and help students by truly presenting the results of assessment. With this key role in assessment, teachers have to consider what their own values are before making the assessments (McMillan, 2001b).

Other Effects of Teacher Value

The effects of teacher value are also present in the teachers’ interaction with students (Harden & Crosby, 2000; Ryan, 1993; Squires, 1999; Veugelers, 2000). Squires (1999) maintains that teachers’ behaviors are the distinct functions that draw students’ attention in an unconscious way. Teachers may not see themselves as models, but it is difficult for them
to avoid being the exemplars that influence students. Harden and Crosby (2000) also discuss the importance of teachers as models, with their attitudes and feelings influencing students. Veugelers (2000) clearly points out the importance of interaction between teachers and students, when teacher value affects students’ thoughts and behaviors directly and without awareness.
Method

Sample

The sample in this study is the English teacher who serves in college-level school. Eight participating schools were selected randomly, with two public and two private schools from research regions of each country. Thirty-two English teachers came from these eight schools, and all of them participated voluntarily. Sixteen of these thirty-two English teachers are American and teach at the University of Louisville, Jefferson Community College, Spalding University, and Bellarmine University, with an equal number from each school. The first two of the selected schools are public and the latter two are private. The other sixteen English teachers are Taiwanese and teach in National Chung Hsing University, National Taichung Teacher College, Chaoyang University of Technology, and Nan Kai College, with an equal number from each school. The first two of the selected schools are public and the latter two are private. The participating teachers were selected by their prior agreements for cooperation. The numbers of male and female teachers were uncertain before survey; if the numbers were even after all data were collected, the variable of teacher’s gender could be considered in this study.
Survey Questions

This research adopts the theory of Shaver and Strong (1982) that values are divided into moral values and amoral values.

For the purpose of discovering teachers’ perspectives on teacher value, the survey questions are divided into two sections. The first section includes general information such as gender, age, number of years of teaching experience, and the date. The second section, for respondents to understand the questions of research more clearly, begins with the definition of teacher value and the explanations of moral and amoral values. This section is developed for investigating teachers’ perceptions of teacher value. Question 1 and Question 7 ask teachers to rank a list of moral and amoral values from 1 to 10 with 1 being most important and 10 being least important. Based on the definition of Shaver and Strong, and for the purposes of this study, moral values comprise 10 items: cooperation, democracy, equal opportunity, freedom of speech, honesty, justice, love, respect, responsibility, and sincerity; amoral values comprise 10 items: cheerfulness, enthusiasm, individualization, innovation, involvement, obedience, open-mindedness, personalization, student cohesiveness, and task orientation. Question 2 to Question 6 investigate teachers’ perspectives on the importance of moral values in five educational components: curriculum, teaching
strategy, assessment, relationship with students, and classroom climate. Question 8 to Question 12 investigate teachers’ perspectives on the importance of amoral values in the above five components. Teachers are asked to use the five-point Likert scale to reflect their opinions. Additionally, teachers have to provide example or event according to each question.

Research Procedure

Before the interview, a packet was mailed to English teachers of the selected schools to invite their cooperation. The packet included a letter inviting voluntary participation, the informed consent, and the survey questions. Participants were assured of confidentiality, informed of the contents, purposes, and research procedures of this study, and given information to contact the researcher and appropriate supervisor if needed. The first two teachers who responded with their agreements to cooperate were selected and appointments were also made.

Data Analysis

The data analyses in this study consist of two statistical procedures with both qualitative and quantitative methods. In the survey of teachers, all responses were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively, and arranged in order to present teachers’ perspectives on teacher value. Otherwise,
the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 10.0 for Microsoft Windows was also used to consider the teachers’ responses as in the research questions. The descriptive statistics and the .05 level of statistical significance were used for all statistical tests.
**Results**

This study was an investigation of teachers’ perspectives on teacher value and its importance on teachers’ work toward education. Thirty-two teachers participated in this study. Because the numbers of male and female teachers were even after all data were collected, the variable of teacher’s gender was considered.

Of the 32 participating teachers, half of them serve in public school and half serve in private school. Half are male and half are female. Half are American and half are Taiwanese. The results of the investigation are presented according to school characteristics, gender, nationality, age, and years of teaching experience.

**Teachers’ Perspectives on Moral Value**

The three moral values that participating teachers thought most important were responsibility, sincerity, and honesty. Table 4 shows responses according to teachers’ school characteristics, gender, and nationality.
Table 4. Three Important Moral Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public school</th>
<th>Private school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Love</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>America</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows teachers’ three most important moral values by age groups: 30 to 39, 40 to 49, and more than 50 years old.

Table 5. Three Important Moral Values (with variable of age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30~39</th>
<th>40~49</th>
<th>Over 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Equal opportunity</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows teachers’ three most important moral values grouped by years of teaching experience: less than 10, 10 to 19, 20 to 29, and more than 30 years.

Table 6. Three Important Moral Values (with variable of the number of years of teaching experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 10</th>
<th>10~19</th>
<th>20~29</th>
<th>Over 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>Sincerity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The two moral values that most participant teachers thought least important were “freedom of speech” and “democracy.” All participating teachers, regardless of school characteristics, gender, or nationality, ranked these two items as least important.

Most participating teachers considered moral values important to curriculum, teaching strategy, assessment, relationship with students, and classroom climate. Table 7 shows their ratings of these items. The numbers in this table are the mean scores, with 5.00 being the highest.

Table 7. Importance of Moral Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public school</th>
<th>Private school</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>America</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching strategy</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with students</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results showed no significant correlation between teachers’ perspectives and variables of age and number of year of teaching experience. The exceptions are the teachers who serve in public school and Taiwanese teachers. In public school in both America and Taiwan, the older the teachers are, the lower importance they assigned moral values on relationship with students (Pearson correlation $r = -0.88$, significance level $p < 0.05$, with all tests being two-tailed). In addition, the more years of teaching experience those teachers have, the less important they ranked moral values on
relationship with students \( (r = -0.78, p < 0.05) \). In Taiwan, the older the teachers are, the lower importance they assigned moral values on teaching strategy \( (r = -0.88, p < 0.05) \). Additionally, the more years of teaching experience those teachers have, the lower importance they assigned moral values on teaching strategy \( (r = -0.71, p < 0.05) \).

**Teachers’ Perspectives on Amoral Values**

The three amoral values that participating teachers thought most important were enthusiasm, involvement, and open-mindedness. Table 8 presents the results according to teachers’ school characteristics, gender, and nationality.

**Table 8. Three Important Amoral Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public school</th>
<th>Private school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>America</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 presents the three amoral values that teachers thought most important according to age: 30 to 39, 40 to 49, and more than 50 years old.
Table 9. Three Important Amoral Values (with variable of age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 presents the three amoral values that teachers thought most important according to range of teaching experience: less than 10, 10 to 19, 20 to 29, and more than 30 years.

Table 10. Three Important Amoral Values (with variable of the number of years of teaching experience)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–19</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Individualization</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Obedience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two amoral values that most participating teachers thought least important were “obedience” and “student cohesiveness.” No matter what kind of school the teachers serve, or whether they are male or female teachers, American or Taiwanese, teachers valued these two items least important of 10 items they were asked to rank.

Overall, most participating teachers ranked amoral values as important in curriculum, teaching strategy, assessment, relationship with students, and classroom climate. Table 11 presents teachers’ perceptions on these items. The numbers in this table are the mean scores, with 5.00 being the
highest.

Table 11. Importance of Amoral Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public school</th>
<th>Private school</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>America</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching strategy</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with students</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom climate</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results showed no significant correlation between teachers’ perspectives and their age or years of teaching experience. There are three exceptions. First, in all participant teachers, the older the teachers are, the lower importance they placed on amoral values in assessment ($r = -.52, p < .05$). Also, among Taiwanese teachers only, the older they are, the less important they considered amoral values to be on teaching strategy ($r = -.74, p < .05$) and on classroom climate ($r = -.88, p < .05$).
Discussion, Implications, and Recommendations

Discussion

Total Participating Teachers

In the given list of ten moral values, the three most important for all participating teachers were responsibility, sincerity and honesty (Table 4). When considering the variable of the teacher’s age, the results vary, but responsibility and sincerity still stand in the primary position (Table 5). Results are similar in considering the years of teaching experience, that is, responsibility and sincerity are ranked most important (Table 6). Among amoral values, enthusiasm, involvement, and open-mindedness are the three most important values for all participating teachers (Table 8). The results are the same when considering the variable of teacher’s age (Table 9), but vary when considering the number of years of teaching experience (Table 10). The teachers who had less than 30 years of teaching experience had similar perspectives, but teachers who had more than 30 years of teaching experience considered obedience to be important, which is the least important value among all participating teachers. Two of the three participating teachers who had more than 30 years of teaching experience ranked obedience to be very important. Enthusiasm is the primary amoral value that participating teachers considered.
Related to educational components of curriculum, teaching strategy, assessment, relationship with students, and classroom climate, all participating teachers thought teacher value is most important in relationship with students and least important in assessment, regardless of moral or amoral values. Regarding moral values, there is no correlation between teachers’ perspectives and their ages. However, among those educational components, older teachers perceived amoral values least important to assessment.

Public and Private School Teachers

In ranking the important moral values, the responses of public and private school teachers are varied; but on average, both valued responsibility as the most important value (Table 4). Compared to moral values, public and private school teachers have more similar opinions in important amoral values. Both groups ranked enthusiasm to be the most important value, and also gave involvement a higher score (Table 8). In ranking the importance of moral and amoral values in curriculum, teaching strategy, assessment, relationship with students, and classroom climate, both public and private school teachers thought moral values are most important in relationship with students, and least important in assessment (Table 7). Although public school teachers believed that moral values are important in their relationship with students, their age and years of teaching experience have converse correlation with the importance of moral values on
those relationships. Public and private school teachers had dissimilar perceptions in the importance of amoral values, with amoral values being most important in curriculum and least important in assessment for public school teachers, and being most important in relationship with students and least important in curriculum for private school teachers (Table 11). Generally, the results show that private school teachers ranked teacher value to be more important than public school teachers did. In addition, compared to public school teachers, private school teachers ranked teacher value to be more important in classroom climate.

Male and Female Teachers

Male and female teachers have similar perceptions in ranking important moral values. Both of these two groups perceived responsibility and respect to be the most important moral values (Table 4). They also have like opinions in amoral values. Both groups ranked enthusiasm, involvement, and open-mindedness to be the three most important amoral values with the same sequence (Table 8). In ranking the importance of teacher value in curriculum, teaching strategy, assessment, relationship with students, and classroom climate, female teachers ranked teacher value to be more important than male teachers did. Both male and female teachers ranked teacher value to be most important in relationship with students, but had different opinions regarding to which item teacher value is least important. Among those educational
components, male teachers perceived teacher value to be least important in assessment, and female teachers perceived it to be least important in curriculum (Table 7, 11).

American and Taiwanese Teachers

American and Taiwanese teachers have similar opinions in ranking the importance of teacher value. They perceived responsibility and sincerity to be the most important moral values (Table 4), and enthusiasm and involvement to be the most important amoral values (Table 8). These two groups of participating teachers both perceived teacher value to be most important in relationship with students, but had different opinions regarding to which item teacher value is least important. American teachers thought teacher value is least important is assessment, and Taiwanese teachers thought it least important in teaching strategy (Table 7, 11). On the average, Taiwanese teachers ranked teacher value, apart from moral or amoral values, to be more important than American teachers ranked it. The variables of age and years of teaching experience influenced Taiwanese teachers’ perspectives on teacher value. In moral values, the older the Taiwanese teachers were or the more years of teaching experience the Taiwanese teachers had, the less importance they placed on teaching strategy. In amoral values, the older the Taiwanese teachers are, the less importance they placed on teaching strategy and classroom climate.
Findings

This study explored teachers’ perspectives on teacher value and its importance in curriculum, teaching strategy, assessment, relationship with students, and classroom climate. Also, the school characteristics, gender, nationality, and the variables of age and years of teaching experience were explored. Following are the conclusions of research results.

1. In teacher value, all participating teachers ranked responsibility, sincerity, and honesty to be the three most important moral values, and enthusiasm, involvement, and open-mindedness to be the three most important amoral values. They perceived teacher value to be most important in their relationship with students and least important in assessment.

2. Public school and private school teachers had dissimilar perspectives on teacher value, whether moral or amoral values.

3. Male and female teachers had similar perspectives on teacher value.

4. American and Taiwanese teachers had similar perspectives on teacher value.

5. Although the teacher’s age influenced some Taiwanese teachers’ perspectives on teacher value, overall, the research results show that age was not an influential variable in teachers’ perspectives on teacher value.
6. There were a few exceptions among Taiwanese teachers, but generally, the research results indicate that years of teaching experience was not an influential variable in teachers’ perspectives on teacher value.

Implications

Veugelers (2000) indicates that teacher value influences teacher’s thinking, teaching, and student’s learning; and students prefer a teaching strategy in which teachers express their own values clearly. This study contributes to the growing body of literature on teacher value, and the findings of this research support the idea that teacher value is important to curriculum, teaching strategy, assessment, teacher’s relationship with students, and also to the classroom climate. This study suggests the values teachers may consider important, including moral and amoral values. The research results also illustrate how teachers with different school characteristics, gender and nationality perceive teacher value.

Recommendations

This research study could be expanded in three ways to add to the information already gathered. First, a future investigation may not be limited to English classes; it could be extended to various courses in order to explore the diversity of teachers’ perspectives in different subjects. Second, schools investigated could be expanded to other
levels of school, such as preschool, primary, middle, or high school. Third, the geographical range within America and Taiwan could be broadened to include all regions of these two countries, or include other countries.

Furthermore, based on the teachers’ responsibility to make students succeed, and given the awareness of the importance of teacher value, more attention must be focused on how teacher value affects student performance. This study recommends a follow-up study of the relationship between teacher value and students’ academic achievement.
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大學英文教師之教師價值觀研究

林以凱
朝陽科技大學師資培育中心

摘要

價值觀是人類思想及行為的根基：它不但為人類的一舉一動提供方向，也為人類作決策時提供準則。因此，個人所有的行為動機、態度、判斷標準、以及願景，皆來自其獨特的價值觀。教師價值觀，是教師在其工作上所擁有的中心信仰及評量標準，它不但直接支配教師的思想及行為，也間接且無形的影響學生。因此，身為教育中極重要的角色，教師價值觀的重要性有其研究之必要。

本研究旨在探討教師價值觀，包括道德性及非道德性價值觀，在教師工作上的重要性。研究問題有二：一、定義教師所須具備之重要價值觀，以及二、探討教師價值觀在課程、教學策略、評量、師生關係、以及教室氣氛之重要性。三十二位來自八所不同國家（台灣及美國）及不同性質（公立及私立）的大學校院教師參與本研究之訪談，所得資料以SPSS統計套裝軟體及質性研究法分析。研究結果發現，「負責」及「熱忱」為所有受訪教師認為最重要的教師價值觀，且教師價值觀在師生關係上為最重要，而在教師的評量工作上最不重要。此外，男性與女性教師，以及台灣與美國教師在教師價值觀上之看法較相似，
但公立學校與私立學校教師之看法則較不相同。教師之年紀與教學年資對臺灣教師在教師價值觀之看法雖有些許影響，但整體而言，此二項目並不為影響教師價值觀之重要因素。本研究建議教師可釐清及修正所具有之價值觀，以增進學生在校之學習成就。

關鍵詞：教師價值觀、道德性價值觀、非道德性價值觀、師生關係